

THE STUDENT WORLD

UT OMNES UNUM SINT

The Call to Revolution

THIRD QUARTER 1934

THE STUDENT WORLD

Serial Number 107

The Call to Revolution

		Page
Editorial		
The Call to Revolution	<i>F. P. M.</i>	193
Revolution and Youth in Soviet Russia	<i>P. Anderson</i>	197
Revolution in the Age of Nationalism	<i>J. Karus</i>	204
Preparation in France	<i>D. de Rougemont</i>	212
Students and Revolution in U. S. A.	<i>F. A. Henson</i>	219
L'Appel du Fascisme à la Jeunesse	<i>A. Sibille</i>	226
Summary		230
British University Students and the Class War	<i>E. Barker</i>	232
Thoughts on Christian Revolution	<i>J. Maritain</i>	234
Christianity and Revolution	<i>G. Fedotoff</i>	243
The Christian Attitude to Class War	<i>J. B. Groser</i>	251
The Editors' Travel Diary		256
The Student World Chronicle		260
The Idol of Young India	<i>W. A. Visser 't Hooft</i>	260
The Position of Protestant Christianity in Japan and China	<i>F. P. Miller</i>	263
The International Student Organisations in the Crisis of International Cooperation.		273
Book Reviews		280
Notes on Contributors and Articles		287

The Student World is published in January, April, July and October. *The price of a single annual subscription, post paid, is 5s. ; 4.00 marks ; 5.00 Swiss francs ; \$ 1.50. Single Copies 2s. ; 1.20 marks ; 1.50 Swiss francs ; \$ 0.50. Subscriptions may be sent to any of the addresses given below :*

Australia:	Student Christian Movement, 182 Collins Street, Melbourne
Canada:	Murray Brooks, 1164 Bay Street, Toronto 5
China:	Kiang Wen Han, 20 Museum Road, Shanghai.
France:	Fédération Française des A.C.E., 11 rue Jean-de-Beauvais Paris V.
Germany:	H. Wehrmann, Flensburgerstr. 9, Berlin N. W. 87.
Great Britain and Ireland:	Miss Xenia Braikevitch, Annandale, Golders Green, London. N. W. 11.
Holland:	Bureau N.C.S.V., Woudschoten, Woudenbergse Straatweg, Zeist.
India:	National Student Department, Y.W.C.A. (Publications), 134 Corporation Street, Calcutta
New Zealand:	Walter Nash, P.O. Box 310, Wellington
South Africa:	F. S. Liebenberg, P.O. Box 25, Stellenbosch, Cape Province
U.S.A.:	Student Y.M.C.A., 347 Madison Avenue, New York City Student Y.W.C.A., 600 Lexington Avenue, New York City

or to the general office of the World's Student Christian Federation, 13 rue Calvin, Geneva, Switzerland (Chèque Postal No. 13192).

The names of the various national and international student movements affiliated to the Federation and also the addresses to which correspondence should be sent are printed on the third page of this cover.

THE STUDENT WORLD

A quarterly magazine published at 13 Rue Calvin, Geneva
by the World's Student Christian Federation

Dr. W. A. VISSER 't HOOFT *Editor*

VOLUME XXVII

Third Quarter, 1934

NUMBER 3

EDITORIAL

The Call to Revolution

The tragedy of modern life is that while the call to revolution is imperative, the calls that are being given do not produce the radical transformation of life that is required. Neither communism nor fascism represent the birth of a new society but rather the apotheosis of the old. In neither case has a transvaluation of basic values taken place. The orientation towards life remains fundamentally the same as in pre-revolutionary days. Instead of a transformation a transfer has taken place. The essence of these revolutions is the transfer of the values of the 19th century individual to the 20th century collectivity. The Manchester Economic Man has become the Economic National Being of Russia or Italy or Germany or Great Britain or Japan.

The modern revolutionist has discovered a new way of salvation. It is that one can be saved by being collectivized. Even the vices of the individual are transformed into glorious virtues when transferred to the National Being.

While rightly expressing the utmost contempt for the philosophy of laissez-faire in individual life, the communist or fascist revolutionist reveals how meaningless his revolution is when he utilizes this same philosophy as a basis for relations between

collectivities. His contention that "enlightened self-interest" is self-destructive for the individual is sound Christian teaching. He that saveth his life shall lose it. The break-down of the capitalist system is a confirmation of this truth. But if this is true for individual life it is also true for collective life. In so far as the revolution consists in merely shifting the emphasis from absolutizing the "enlightened self-interest" of the individual to absolutizing the "enlightened self-interest" of the class or nation or race, no fundamental change in life-attitude has taken place. The expansion of individualism into collectivism is a demagogic manœuvre and not a profound life re-creation. The revolutionist who thinks differently has yet to learn that if individual action based on "enlightened self-interest" in the capitalist system has produced appalling injustice and social chaos, the action of deified collectivities based on "enlightened self-interest" will produce a world holocaust.

The communist and fascist revolutions are superficial. They are not fundamental. The fundamental revolution the world needs is the Christian Revolution. The call of that revolution is "he that loseth his life shall save it" instead of "enlightened self-interest".

The Christian recognises that in a world where capitalism and nationalism are dominant there will be war — both civil and imperialistic. But, while recognising the inevitability of violence in this kind of a world, he repudiates the method of violence as the method of his revolution. Since the appeal to persuasion rather than to coercive force constitutes the intrinsic preference of the Christian ethic, the Christian can never regard the appeal to class struggle as "good news". He may have to accept that struggle as the doom of a decadent civilisation, but the application of the ethics of the class struggle means for him a perpetuation of the ethics of capitalism and imperialism — a retrogression to the law of the beasts.

In place of the class struggle the Christian puts the struggle of the Church with civilisation. He is conscious of being a citizen of two worlds — of the actual world and of the City of God. For him creative life springs out of the tension between the claims of these two citizenships. Lenin used to speak of the "new society" having been disclosed to him by the seventy

days of the Paris Commune in 1871. The Christian says that the new society (the Church) was disclosed to him by the life and death and resurrection of Jesus Christ. It is in that disclosure that he sees the meaning of the Reign of God, the meaning of citizenship in the City of God, and the implications of this for his citizenship in the city of men.

The Church is the bridge between the two cities. Through its fellowship of penitence and reconciliation men come to discern the judgment of God and to recognise the creative activity of God. In the life of the Church men develop a living method of dealing with social actualities, and by using this method profoundly influence the character and structure of general society.

The Protestant Christian knows that throughout vast sections of western society the Church is dead. It is dead in part because it has become the puppet of a race, a class or a state. But he also knows that the Church will live again.

He is conscious, however, that before it is revived an enormous amount of spade work will have to be done. This spade work involves :

Discarding for ever the paralysing ascription to the State of omnipotence within its territorial domain, an ascription which large bodies of Protestants have inherited from the Reformation.

Developing a more adequate theory of the relation between the two societies — the Church and the State.

Mobilising the dispersed but visible and living resources of the Church Universal.

Teaching that " God the Creator " implies a dynamic and changing social order, and that it is God's Will that a more just social order should be established.

Announcing the " judgment of God " upon societies founded on " enlightened self-interest " upon the exploitation of man by man, and upon the maldistribution of national wealth ; and explaining the implication of life lived in responsible relationship as members one of another.

Learning to distinguish between Christian Faith and Christian Action and developing a strategy of Christian

Action both for individuals and for groups in relation to general society.

The application of this programme would not mean a counter-revolution. On the contrary it would be the only real revolution, because it would be the only revolution whose appeal was based on a true rather than on a false estimate of man's nature. Man is not in essence an economic animal. He is a super-economic creature. And his uniqueness as man lies precisely in the region that is over and above his economic interests. Nietzsche was right when he said that man is a thing to be surpassed. It is in this realm of over and aboveness that the Christian Revolution takes place making man aware that he is potentially a son of God. The Christian Revolution transforms man from a beast whose interests are only economic into a "new creature", who, since his interests are more than economic, has both the desire and the will to order his economic life not in his own interest but in the interest of all the members of His Father's Family.

Francis P. MILLER

Revolution and Youth in Soviet Russia

PAUL B. ANDERSON

The Revolution of 1917, which gave Russia the new name of Union of Socialist Soviet Republic, was not a revolution of youth. It was a struggle of class against class, of one mode of life against another mode of life. To conceive of the overthrow of the Tsar or the blotting out of the temporary government as the climax of a revolt of young Russia is to miss the entire point of the Revolution. The Bolshevik Revolution of 1917 reflected very little of youth psychology, of the new versus the old, of the rise of a new generation. It was rather the coming to power of a generation already tried by fire, equipped with a world-view and programme which only mature minds could have perfected. In this revolution and in the civil war which followed, as well as throughout the Five Year Plan and up to our day, youth has been on both sides of the conflict. The dividing line in a Marxist revolution is drawn by social and economic interest, by class, not by age.

The comprehensiveness and completeness of the Marxist theory of revolution and government preclude leadership by youth. The Revolution has been directed by those men and women of middle age who have achieved discipline in thought and action; it is they who have set the objective, marked the course, issued orders and punished opposition, whether in young or old. Yet youth has by no means been a secondary factor. Its rôle is rather complementary than supplementary. The theory and practice of communism gives as important a place to the boy of twelve as to the veteran workman of forty-five, and its genius has been to use every one to the maximum of his capacities and energy. Each in his place is a full-fledged revolutionary, shouldered with responsibility, subject to discipline and rewarded with honour as a hero of the class struggle whenever his action advances the "construction of socialism". Communism knows no age; it recognises only attitude and action. It has led all governments and social practice in organising the life

of the whole population in a manner which gives every one equal opportunity, equal responsibility and equal reward, varied only by the individual's capacity to grasp the idea of socialism and his self-discipline in its execution. Nowhere is so much expected of every individual, and especially of youth, and in no country has youth participated so widely or effectively in production of goods, in social reconstruction and in practical government. The idea of coming of age, of maturity is foreign to communism. Childhood in Russia is no bar to full responsibilities of citizenship and no excuse for failure to carry them. In communism you have a practical carrying out of the theory of "diversity of gifts but the same spirit", which St. Paul so earnestly urged upon the Christian community in Corinth.

Children in school are "purged" — expelled, denied all hope of education — if they show an attitude toward life contrary to the spirit of Karl Marx and Lenin. They are expected to set themselves tasks related to industrial production, and have actually contributed greatly, e.g. by gathering scrap iron otherwise wasted. The disciplines of "class vigilance" are demanded of barefoot youngsters and serious students no less than of factory workmen, and this vigilance must be turned not only toward citizens of their own age but toward all. The child is equally responsible with the adult in the matter of living out the spirit of the Revolution. He is class-conscious, subject to revolutionary discipline and made to realise that only the construction of socialism may share its benefits.

It is this organic unity, integration of each individual into the whole body politic, that makes possible the astonishing freedom and creative energy among youth in the USSR. In no country is youth so politically informed, so vociferous in criticism, so active in community and national life. In China the enthusiasm of youth has perhaps been equally unhampered in verbal expression, but it has not been so carefully led into practical results in economic and social benefits for the nation. What a contrast with those situations where youth is considered irresponsible, sowers of wild oats, a generation to be slightly pampered, but duly held in check

until the day when it comes to its senses and, after a period of tutelage, sits in the seats of its forebearers. The difference between these two situations lies partly in political theory and partly in educational practice. The communist theory that no primary divisions exist in society, neither age, sex, blood nor breeding, but only class in the Marxist sense, sets up a situation in which division is vertical rather than horizontal, all ages of the proletariat against all ages of the *bourgeoisie*. There should be no conflict between youth and age, but only between class and class.

While this difference is fundamental as a theory, the second is even more important in practice. The communist educational system has been based on the principle of release of inner powers rather than on inculcation of external facts. The facts are made available in suitable form and digestible quantity for the nourishment of the enquiring mind by eager assimilation rather than by enforced cramming. Yet this is but a part and not the most significant part of the communist educational system. There are two other factors. The first is again an appropriation of Pauline theology, or of modern psychology, as you like. Growth in mind to the attainment of the perfect man is conditioned upon the presence of the proper spirit: for Christians this is rebirth in Christ, the Grace of God given in baptism and nurtured in faith; for communism it is class-consciousness controlled by revolutionary discipline. All education is in vain except it be imbued with and the reflection of the proper spirit. No man can rise to real authority, though he may be employed and even exploited as a specialist, unless he has the right spirit within him. If he has it, his progress is free within the limits laid down by the general line of the party. The second factor is the constant application of the dialectic method. Youth is reared in conflict. In a beginner's reader the first sentence is "I am not a slave", thus setting up the atmosphere of class-consciousness in which words, facts, science are to be acquired, as well as the method of progressing from one idea to the next.

Youth in Russia is thus made an integrated part of the revolutionary process. Youth is not in revolt: youth is

not expected to be conscious of itself, it is conscious only of the Revolution. The Revolution embraces youth as it embraces everything, but its inherent dialectic constitutes a living principle, a constant ferment, an active process in which the minds and spirit of youth are the molecules, the objective realities, both satisfying the process and being satisfied by it. This is not a rejection of the individual, but it is a surrender of the individual — again a phrase from St. Paul comes to mind — in order that the Revolution may live in the individual.

It is a commonplace to speak of the enthusiasm of youth. Communism depends upon enthusiasm. Where lacking or frayed, it is instilled or stimulated by application of the dialectic principle. "Socialist competition" between groups of factory workers, pioneer groups, shock work brigades, collective farms, serves the useful purpose of whipping up enthusiasm as is done for a college football game in the United States. "*Subbotniki*" or sabbatical days are organised, ostensibly to give release to mass enthusiasm in the form of voluntary overtime work without pay on special tasks, like a day of excavation for the new Moscow metro. Parades with banners and floats, mass meetings of protest, criticism or approbation, posters and leaflets, radio and cinema are all brought to play on the emotions of youth. The Five Year Plan with its daring objectives was a most astonishing stimulus to mass enthusiasm, where the dialectic process lay between the workers and their well-nigh unachievable goals. For a while enthusiasm was developed over competition with the achievements of other countries. "Beat America", "Overtake and surpass", — such have been the slogans of the recent years. In general the most masterful efforts are used to keep revolutionary emotions at the highest pitch.

Another means of identifying youth with the Revolution has been that of giving it "*chefsvo*", patronage over vital undertakings. The Comsomol was first made Patron of the Red Fleet, then of the Air Force, then of the "*Vseobuch*", universal primary education. At Comsomol conventions a delegation from the fleet appears with fife and drum, salutes

and "reports" to its patron. Actually the Comsomol does little to help the fleet but its pride is flattered and identity with the Revolution is confirmed.

The critical spirit of youth is utilised to the full. *Comsolskaya Pravda*, the organ of youth, abounds with scathing criticism in the form of direct allegation, satire, caricature and appeal for action. The object is to create a public opinion under the guise of which party or social organs can act to remedy faults in industrial or social life, and to punish with impunity, since it is done "in response to revolutionary opinion". Investigating commissions of youth called "light cavalry" are sent to factories, schools, student dormitories and social institutions to check up on slackness or inefficiency. Naturally this critical attitude is encouraged also with references to personal views and habits. One has to realise that honour, loyalty, even honesty become relative terms during the class struggle, all being subordinated to the chief end, the Revolution. A boy of twelve denounces his father and is proclaimed a hero in the Moscow press, while the father is punished with the ardour of class hatred.

"Worker correspondents" numbering over a million and a half, write denunciations of individuals and enterprises, and the daily press publishes many of them, giving name, date and place. It is not surprising that many of these "correspondents" who elsewhere would be called spies and denunciators, are beaten up and even killed. This process is the practical dialectic on which the Revolution is being built.

Thus we see that youth is not always left the easy task; it is rarely pampered. Rather, some of the most onerous, dangerous and thankless jobs are assigned to it. When in 1929 the collectivisation of agriculture was decided upon and the village population began to filibuster, twenty-five thousand Comsomoltsi were mobilised in ten days time, and sent to the villages with instruction to liquidate the "kulaks" (the resisters of communism in the villages), and force through the process of collectivisation. This task involved terrible experiences — bloodshed, rank injustice, sending whole families to the frozen north or Siberia — the experiences of civil war but without its heroic features, for it was accomplish-

ed by a ruthless hand on a helpless and defenceless population. Many of the youth sent on this punitive expedition succumbed to its terrors, returned benumbed and listless, or even lost their belief in the sacredness of the cause of the Communist Revolution.

It is not surprising that the years of collectivisation and the first Five Year Plan have been succeeded by a notable lack of revolutionary fervour. The injustices and slight economic reward of collectivisation, and the shallow successes of the Five Year Plan, have left youth bewildered over their fate. It may be only a reaction and slump after the tremendous enthusiasm shown from 1929-1932, or it may be a more fundamental inner process. In any case the interests of youth are now of different quality. Life is less heroic. Enthusiasm has become professionalised — *Comsomolskaya Pravda* on April 29, 1934, reported that three fourths of all the workmen in industry and railway transport now take part in shock work. The pathos has become chronic, and so is no longer pathos. There is no evidence that youth is widely disillusioned about the Revolution, but it has soberly come to realise that revolution is a business, not an episode. Enthusiasm rationalised becomes creativeness. Thousands of ideas, suggestions, inventions, improvements are pouring from the brains of young workers, and these are caught up and utilised for the strengthening of the Revolution through greater production and less waste.

Two other fundamental changes in the attitudes of youth must be noted, both the result of an awakening to the fact that there is much more in the world than the crude facts of economic materialism and class struggle. Three years ago Comrade Kossareff, general secretary of the Comsomol, appeared at the All-Union Conference wearing collar and necktie, and much of the discussion centered around personal habits of cleanliness, orderliness, even love and family. At the beginning of 1933 the keynote of promise in Stalin's speech to the Collective Farm Congress was "the comfortable life". The XVII Party Conference in 1934 started, or perhaps caught up, general interest in "culture". In the four months that have followed, the press has been flooded

with articles on culture, the Chair of History has been restored to Moscow University, and extra-curricular "universities of culture" have been established in half a dozen of the leading higher educational institutions. The "class enemy" at home sinks in the swamps or freezes in the cold of Siberian exile, the "capitalist exploiters" abroad are held at bay by Voroshiloff's mechanised and air-equipped army or neutralised by Litvinoff's pacts; the Revolution pauses to read the classics (new editions are announced), and "engineers of narrow speciality" are scoffed at for ignorance of Chopin or Leonardo.

A second fundamental change came with the rediscovery of Lenin's remark that socialism could be built in one country without waiting for the world revolution. The Comintern was discomfited, while youth in Russia began to realise that they were territorial patriots. It remains to be seen how this will jibe with the classical attitude of class-conscious world revolutionaries. On the 9th of June even an official resolution of the Central Executive Committee of the USSR used the term "homeland" without the equivocative adjective "socialistic". The apotheosis of world revolution turns out to be a metamorphosis of national socialism.

Does this mean that the Revolution is over? By no means. These are but effervescences of human longings which may be retained or suppressed according to the help or hindrance they prove to be to the Revolution. They are a sort of cultural NEP, needed to replenish the spirits of the people. While giving rein to the fantasies of life, the party continues its purging process under the direction of a new organisation known as the Commission of Party Control, and Lenin's great achievement of party democracy has given way to increased concentration of power in the hands of the party leader, Stalin. The political discipline required of youth is not diminished by the granting of greater intellectual freedom, and the soul is not at all free to seek for God. The Revolution needs a new intelligentsia to carry forward the ideology as well as engineers to handle mechanical constructions, and we are now in the period of formation of this new class out of the youth of Russia. It will be two or three years before its true character will be revealed.

Revolution in the Age of Nationalism

J. KARUS

No political problem is as difficult for Christians to judge as the problem of revolution. It has nevertheless received far less consideration than the problem of war. Until recently the two main schools of political-theological thought — the authoritative, conservative school and the democratic, evolutionary one — believed they had done with thinking out the problem of revolution, either by rejecting it completely or by forcing the revolutionary eddies and torrents into the smooth-flowing stream of gradual development. Recent history has revealed the alarming superficiality of both conceptions.

When Christians were confronted with bolshevism, they were not obliged to make personal and moral decisions regarding their attitude to revolution, for they were soon dragged by brute force into the position of sufferers. That necessarily led to a *religious* struggle as to the meaning of the revolution, which resulted in untold suffering for the believers in Russia, but the Christian did not have to answer the torturing problem of his own positive and responsible participation in the revolution. In our day, however, the national revolutions expect an answer to this question; for they justify their revolution by reference to God and to the divine command, and, in Europe at least, they seek the collaboration of the Christian Church. Even if the Church cannot and should not directly take part in revolutionary activities, it is demanded that she should at least sanction it.

The Evangelical Church in Germany has done this. In the spring of 1933, she officially and repeatedly declared her unqualified approval of the national revolution. One must not forget, however, that the revolution, as it happened in Germany, was conditioned by two facts. On the one hand, the beginning of the German revolution was a national revival,

aiming at a genuine re-establishment of lost or endangered elements of German culture ; on the other hand, the revolutionary power of national-socialism was formally speaking based on the power of the authorities themselves, for with the parliamentary system then in force, the authorities were backed by the tremendous majority of 15 million voters. Approval of national-socialism and of the authoritative power was natural to a Church which was founded on a biblical creed and in which the Lutheran element predominated. The attitude of the Catholic Church was much more cautious, partly, no doubt, for purely political reasons, but partly also as an expression of her more independent attitude toward national political events. In fact, while approving of the events on the whole, she expressed some relatively strong criticism ; e.g. in the Pastoral Letter of the Bishops' Conference of Fulda in June 1933, from which the following is an extract ; " We trust that what has seemed strange and incomprehensible to us Catholics during the past months may prove to be only the result of a momentary effervescence which, when the situation is made clearer, will sink down again like sediment ". On the other hand, in Protestant circles the " German Christian " group took a very active part in the political revolution, proclaiming — and at the same time practising — the right to revolutionise the Church. The German Christians apply to the new National Protestant Church more or less the same principles which have served in the revolution of state and nation.

Through these latest events in Germany (who, as motherland of the Reformation and through the religious force of her Catholicism, still holds an important place in the oecumenical Church of Christ), the problem of revolution, in all its difficulty — but also with all its seductive and engaging power — has been brought home with renewed force to the conscience of the Christian community. Here, more than in any other case, we must guard against sentimental or moralising conclusions. Following one of the main rules of all Christian reflection, which applies especially to the case of revolution, we should rather judge on the basis of a comprehensive study of the historical facts.

Revolution is the name we usually give to every radical change of government and of the whole political and social circumstances that is carried out forcibly and on a large scale. Most occurrences of this kind, however, can be recognised as consequences, infections or imitations of greater and more deeply-rooted revolutions, which we may describe as the *original* revolutions. These revolutions, in a people that is historically prepared for them, work a spiritual and intellectual change which, by encroaching on different nations and different parts of the world, will determine whole centuries of human development. The first and most obvious aim of all great revolutions is the creation of new political and social orders, but the ultimate and secret task is to clear the way for a new type of human being and human community. Just as the new order can only come into its own when an interior structural change has begun to take place in the nation, so the revolution must clear the track for the full expression of these deeper changes. This can happen only through the transfer of authority to the group of people who represent the new spiritual and intellectual conception within the nation. This is the decisive point in every revolution. The programme of the revolutionary is not the real novelty. The programme has been drawn up, thought out and proclaimed by many different people during the transitory period before the outbreak of the revolution. The really new feature is the governing group of people who, representing a new conception of life, are also for the most part representatives of a rising social class. The difference between this class and the one which has governed hitherto is not necessarily due to a greater supply of energy, but invariably to this new conception of life ; it has already unconsciously and vicariously undergone the change in the intellectual and spiritual structure, and it now throws it into the balance, not as the aim of knowledge and will, but as an experienced reality. And this reality, which the revolutionary has already experienced, still lies ahead for the masses ; it is this that gives the revolutionary his authority.

The strength of the old regime is not necessarily less ; its moral authority may even be greater. When we say

that epochs which are nearing their end produce offshoots that are both noble and outstanding, we are quoting an almost general law. The revolutionaries, on the other hand, are full of uncontrolled dynamics and unsatisfied longing for the new rights, putting aside traditional order out of hate for the old system. They are obliged to set imperfectly-trained forces, whose most effective weapon is a passionate heart, against the well-drilled, disciplined powers of the existing system. They are attacking, and the old state is defending; and the aggressor is always in the more difficult position. And finally: they lack the moral support of the law behind them. The existing system is sanctified by the law. The genuine revolutionary is lawless, and even if he is so from compulsion, he attracts those who are lawless from inclination and who disdain the divine orders out of a deeply-rooted lack of discipline.

And yet the revolutionary knows that he is serving a coming law which shall become a basis and refuge for the new man, who is seeking for means of expression. And in the very name of this sacred new ideal, he is a fanatic and a tyrant, and endures — even encourages — in his army those false and outrageous natures which have to perform the baser services of the revolution. Mussolini writes in his autobiography that every revolution produces four types of men: conscientious, self-denying leaders, the masses, the adventurers and the “melancholy intellectuals”, whom he also calls the ascetics of the revolution. The two last are the deadweight of every revolution. The ascetics “cannot understand that no revolution can alter human nature”¹. The adventurers seek their own gain. Even that is doubtless too lenient a description of this last category.

Before trying to form an opinion, let us ask ourselves whether, in the light of this picture, it is right to apply the title *revolutionary* to post-war nationalism. All social and political revolutionary movements of the post-war period stand naturally in the shadow of communism. In bolshevism, communism has beyond all doubt accomplished the great fundamental transformation of our times. Communism is

¹ B. Mussolini, *My Autobiography*, p. 180.

the revolution of one particular class. Its aim is to beat a path for the collective type of man, by making the proletariat the formative, directing power of the earth. Because of the rebuff it has suffered in Europe, we should not assume that communism has already reached the end of its power. Developments in Asia indicate that great activity is in store for it in that part of the world. At any rate, the new man bears the stamp of proletarian destiny.

Nationalism has positive connections with the mass of the working people. But it is far more complicated than bolshevism, both with regard to its social and to its spiritual and intellectual background. All the elements of the old order are represented in its ranks : princes, priests and clergy, nobles, middle-class, peasants and workers. Certainly they are all disinherited—many in respect to their own property, all in respect to their Fatherland. A close relationship exists between the nationally and the economically disinherited. Asia demonstrates this very point. Communism, which has not infrequently hoisted the national banner at opportune moments, has discovered this. But there is also a *tension* between the two, even though no nationalist party will admit it, and so far nationalism has always decided in favour of the "nation" and not of the proletariat. The inclination of the reigning group is directed first of all towards the national, political side, and only in the second place towards the social and economic side.

But it is just in this that it differs polemically from its vanquished predecessors. The liberation and re-creation of the nation, is the new principle with which it replaces the principles of the old individualistic society. Thus the question is raised : *Can "the nation" constitute a revolutionary principle?* In the new nationalistic conception, certainly ! For "nation", or the two corresponding terms "race" and "state", represent very definite moral aesthetic and religious ideals. In this form they can quite well become exponents of a fundamentally new, exclusive and totalitarian conception, and that is all that is necessary for a revolution.

This leads to the second question which must be put to nationalism with regard to its revolutionary character :

Does it really give adequate expression to the decisive spiritual change of the period ? At first it would seem that the collectivisation and standardisation of man can only be fully accomplished in a purely proletarian state ; for these are precisely the destiny of the *proletariat*, and only the proletariat can produce the " original group of people " ¹, which brings forward a new era of human history out of the tragedy and inherent dynamic of this destiny. This would not be contradicted by the fact that the experience of war plays such an important rôle in the formation of the new man, at least in the West. A very close relationship exists between the soldier of the world war, technically trained and uprooted by modern mass-warfare, and the modern industrial worker. Two observations, however, make this simple answer to the question impossible. One is : the " proletarian destiny " is no longer restricted to the category of the industrial working communities of large cities. We have all, through machinery, the world war or post-war poverty, received a uniform stamp. We have long since ceased to be individualists. The supra-individualist powers — nation, state, society, economy — form, force and overcome us. We have become poor and we want to be poor. We are hardened and we want to be hard. We are bound and we bind ourselves. We approve of this change in man, because all of us *are* this new man, born of machinery, war and poverty. The other observation is as follows : Soviet Russia has developed into a state of absolute power, in which purely human welfare, even that of the proletarians themselves who participate in the government of the country, does not play the decisive rôle. In view of this development one wonders whether the meaning of revolution of our day is not the political organisation of the powerful state as such, subjugating the nation to itself instead of serving it. The proletariat, in the sense of the mass which it is and remains, is not capable of freedom even when it represents the ruling class. Called to govern, it appeals to the authoritative, absolute and totalitarian state to guide, form and use it.

¹ According to Rosenstock's *European Revolutions*, p. 27, only an " original group of people " can determine the new law. " Imitation-revolutions ", therefore, never have the fullness and power, of the original revolution.

Nationalism, at least in its full expression in the West, is actually the *revolution of the authoritative state-as-an-aim-in-itself*. It realises the collectivism of our period without, like bolshevism, going the roundabout way of communism; it disciplines the man of the masses and at the same time relies on him. With the help of its ideology of nation and state, it binds the individual and the masses firmly and completely to the sovereign state. It increases to the last degree the authoritative character of the state, and in doing so immensely strengthens its tendency to uniformity and standardisation. Thus nationalism proves itself, through its intellectual and spiritual structure, to be thoroughly capable of fulfilling the proletarian, collectivist ideal of our times, though it proceeds from a quite different angle than communism. We are therefore concerned with a real revolution which, in spite of all contradictions, is closely related to the proletarian world revolution.

What judgment are we, as Christians, to pronounce on this nationalist revolution? First of all we must take a positive attitude toward this new situation. This has nothing at all to do with that kind of shallow opportunism which always conforms with the existing facts. On the contrary, we Christians respect God's hidden ways in the violent, painful and sinful developments of our times. In them we also see the hidden fulfilment of the divine redemption. At the same time, however, we are asked to stand aloof from the events.

The revolution of the authoritative state is certainly no worse than other previous revolutions; there is even a certain element of legality in it, which raises it far above the communist revolution and which should be gratefully recognised. One feels that the prototype of these revolutionaries is the soldier, the man of heroic sacrifices, organic discipline and rigid laws. But it is also the soldier of the world war, "absolutely mobilised", who inevitably has to undergo radical depersonalisation, and who consequently falls into a state of being totally uprooted and *a-moral*. Here is the bridge that leads from the conservative legalist to the proletarian revolutionary. Thus the national revo-

lution, like all violent revolutions, has its very dark aspects. However painful it may be, fighting in a war under the authority of the law is essentially different from a revolutionary fight. The revolution lacks command from a truly authoritative source. Therefore there is always a danger of unbridled licence in a revolution. The Christian should not be stained by this. Let the revolutionaries call this quietism, and point their fingers at him who, in the drastic change of the times, lets others fight and build up a new order. The Christian must obey authority. He cannot rise up against it. And everything separates him from the outrages of the revolutionaries. Wherever he can, he stands out against the violation to body and soul that the enemy, the "counter-revolutionary", is suffering. Even if he approves of the ultimate aim of the revolution, he cannot forget the steps that lead to it and the sacrifices that lie by the road-side. He resists the temptation of "objectivity", which rejoices over the "small sacrifices" of the revolution; he remains constantly aware of his *personal* obligations as a Christian.

The Christian should also realise that he must leave the world, together with his Master, if the world tries to tempt or compel him to act sinfully. It is hard to have to stand aloof from one's people in hours of drastic change. But : one must obey God rather than man.

The solution by way of a non-violent revolution does not exist for the serious Christian who has studied the Bible. Gandhi's attempt has proved that non-cooperation is also violence, and that when once the mass of the people has been stirred into action, a revolution cannot be kept within the ideal tracks of a purely moral and spiritual rebellion.

Preparations in France

DENIS DE ROUGEMENT

The events of last February have put the question of revolution before the whole country in a much more dramatic but at the same time much less clear-cut way than the small groups, which I discussed two years ago in *The Student World*¹, had done so far. The riots on the *Place de la Concorde* have not only revealed disorder in the state but also disorder in the mind of the people. It has created a restlessness which may become a blessing in disguise, but it has also confused the issue. For what has really happened? Decent and patriotic citizens have been massacred by the police. What was their crime? To have shouted, "Down with the thieves" before the *Chambre des Députés*! What was their aim? All kinds of aims have been ascribed to them: Fascist plots, the revolt of civic virtue, the attempt to overthrow Parliament. In fact there was a little of all these elements in this spontaneous manifestation. But there was above all the urge to express collectively a feeling of "malaise" which few have been able to express in clear language. These instinctive and complex reactions are always the most dangerous ones. It is, therefore, no paradox to affirm that if the events of February the 6th led to bloodshed, it was because of the general uncertainty of those involved in them. The tragic clash on the *Pont de la Concorde* was the clash between "partisans of order" with policemen, that is "guardians of order". The complete absence of any clear definition of "order" on either side resulted in indiscriminate shooting.

Now that there is a gradual calming down of spirit, what situation do we find? On the right the *bourgeoisie* suddenly awakened by the political scandals and riots. It begins to discover certain dangers inherent in the old capitalistic

¹ "Risques Salutaires", Fourth Quarter 1932, p. 328.

system as well as the corruption of Parliament and other powers. It is afraid of Marxism. It feels that the hold of the state is weakening. It considers that the hour has come to defend itself by its own means. This explains the success of various patriotic leagues which see their effectives grow very rapidly. Their programmes are extremely vague. They speak of reforming the state, of correcting certain excesses of economic life, of punishing those who are guilty for the political scandals and of assuring greater respect for the civic virtues. Much patriotic talk in the air, some very incoherent proposals, general disgust with Parliament — those are the things which according to the press of the right deserve already the name of "national revolution".

On the left one finds clearer but even more negative aims : to control economic life, to shorten the hours of work and to socialise the banks. But it would seem that the real enthusiasm of the Marxist revolutionaries is concentrated on an idea which is more sentimental than real, namely the struggle against fascism. It happens that there is no fascist party in France. There is only an anti-fascist obsession among the groups of the left. One wonders whether this obsession itself may not lead to the creation of a fascist movement. As socialism spends all its forces in denouncing the "revolution from the right", it throws away its best trump cards : for it makes the impression of a reactionary movement which is surpassed in intensity by pseudo-fascism on the right and by communism on the left. There is also a new formation founded by a younger former member of Parliament, Bergery, which tries without much success to create a common front of all parties of the left. But all these groups have in common that their programmes are extremely meagre and that they have only one clear proposal to make, namely to fight against fascism before such a thing has really come into being.

The opposition between these two so-called revolutions provides the ammunition for the discussions in the press and in political meetings. I believe, however, that these give an absolutely false picture of the real situation and of the real possibilities for action which it presents. It may be that the immediate future still belongs to the political

parties, but whether the left or the right comes to power, none of the really important issues will be solved. In this disorder and uncertainty one should look for new ideas to the younger groups which proclaim resolutely, "Neither the right nor the left", and which alone are engaged in constructive work.

*
* *

Two years ago I gave in *The Student World* a short survey of the young groups that were then in process of formation. The *Cahier de Revendication* which the *Nouvelle Revue Française* published in December 1932 showed for the first time that a "third force" had come into being which was non-Marxistic and anti-capitalist. These groups have developed and become more definite in their aims. The movements which head up this type of revolution and which to my mind represent the only really renovating force are *Esprit* and *L'Ordre Nouveau*.

Let us first state what these groups have in common :

1) They are definitely opposed to capitalism because it creates social injustice, war, unemployment, public immorality and a general obsession by "business" which reveals itself even in the realm of thought. They are also opposed to a mystic nationalism because they consider it as a denaturation of the original and true patriotic sentiment for the sake of the state and the financial world. They reject also the *bourgeois* culture with its all too easy distinction between thought and action.

2) They believe in the affirmation of the rights of human personality, which are always superior to those of the state, affirmation of the primacy of the spiritual (which they define, however, in very different ways), affirmation of the need to reconsider our whole economic organisation right down to its very basis so that partial reforms must be considered quite insufficient, and finally affirmation of a new community spirit which is not based on a *mystique* of race, of class or of party, but on the concrete consciousness of personal responsibility.

These negative and positive convictions show that these younger groups are really trying to make a new start. While the political parties in their struggle for power avoid all fundamental issues and spend their energy on totally antiquated discussions and dishonest polemics, *Esprit* and *L'Ordre Nouveau* hold that we should come to grips with the problem of man himself as he lives in a mechanical civilisation. Their activities may produce less noise and do not make the same demagogic appeal but they are much more radical, for they go right down to the roots of the evil. This explains the slowness but also the thoroughness of their progress which will manifest itself more and more clearly as the further development of the crisis confirms their predictions.

But it is not sufficient to have a sound starting-point. More important is the act of starting itself, for otherwise the *starting-point* becomes no more than a *view-point* which produces nothing except the sterile pleasure so dear to *bourgeois* intellectuals. The question of tactics and the problem of the character of the new institutions which are to be built up must be tackled. It is from this point onward, however, that the two groups begin to differ from each other.

* * *

Esprit is a magazine which is at the same time a research laboratory, a meeting-place for authors of various background and the organ of a team of critics and reformers of present-day society¹. There is considerable vitality in it but also a considerable lack of precision. It is a curious mixture of new leaven and indigestible paste, altogether a rather typical expression of a generation which is still seeking itself and which finds itself first of all in common opposition to the world as it is today. *Esprit* has published a certain number of economic and political plans which are quite good in their general orientation but so detailed that they look rather utopian and so insufficiently related to each other that they do not give a clear picture of the main outline of

¹ The group calls itself "La troisième force".

the future order as a whole. I hope, nevertheless, that *Esprit* may continue its service for a long time, for we need an organ in which young people can express themselves freely, that is without subtle precautions and without too much consideration for the traditional modes of expression which most magazines under the leadership of the older generation impose on their contributors. It is well-known that Frenchmen consider themselves especially "clever" and that they are too often inclined to sacrifice everything in order to live up to this reputation. The clumsy ways of expression which one finds often in *Esprit* seem to me more realistic, more useful and more human than the elegant essays of older intellectuals, even if they are converted to communism.

L'Ordre Nouveau is distinct from *Esprit* in its constructive character and its original tactics. It is led by seven young men who are practically all authors or journalists and it is supported by the work of various cells of technicians, so that it is really what would be called in America a "brain trust". But its activity is not confined to the work of these groups. In addition to the volumes published by the special committee¹ and of the monthly magazine which carries the same name as the movement, there are various groups for public action, especially the *Club de Février* which has accepted the same doctrine and which propagates it through publications, meetings and conferences. The influence of their ideas is much more widespread than one would think from reading the daily press. Numerous slogans which French youth has adopted in the last year have been thought out by *L'Ordre Nouveau* which is fortunately not anxious to maintain a copy-right on ideas. I think, for instance, of the fact that the leagues of ex-service men (whose action may be decisive during the next year) have adopted the slogan "Neither left nor right". Again the ideal of the "personalist mission of France" which the groups of the centre and of the right use in opposition to the Russian and German mass-movement-psychology, and also the idea of a civil work

¹ Especially the works of Aron and Dandieu : *Décadence de la nation française, La révolution nécessaire* and *Dictature de la liberté*; also A. Marc and R. Dupuis *Jeune Europe* and Daniel-Rops *Elements de notre destin*.

service which will become the great battle-cry of the movements of the left, have come from *L'Ordre Nouveau*. This last conception is due to Aron and Dandieu who have given a theoretical outline of the plan in their main work, *La révolution nécessaire*. This problem is patiently studied by a group of engineers and jurists who are trying to work it out concretely in terms of figures and laws. Its aim is nothing less than the suppression of proletarian conditions of life. It hopes to do so by the creation of a work service analogous to military service and destined to assure the whole of mechanised production, (that is to say that work which today is given to manual workers), for the unskilled workers. In this way unemployment would be abolished and production would be made independent of the fatal laws of competition, for the work service would depend on a central office which would have the task to adjust production to consumption as exactly as possible. The rôle of the state would to a large extent be identical with that particular office. All the rest of so-called qualified production would be free and placed under the supervision of regional corporations. Thus the task of the state would be reduced to its simplest expression, namely a bureau of statistics and of distribution. The political tasks would be entrusted to a Federation of "Small Regional Nations".

*
* *

This sketch of a great group of institutions, which is of course far too short and schematic may seem rather utopian. But if one follows the work of *L'Ordre Nouveau* in detail one will discover that it is continually seeking to adapt itself to the actual possibilities in all their diversity. Whatever may happen in the near future to the various groupings inspired by *L'Ordre Nouveau*, these pioneer activities will remain and will some day be incorporated in the whole plan of reconstruction of the country, not only because they represent the most up-to-date and the most coherent thinking which is being done today, but also because they are unique in character. The parties of the left which seemed at one

time destined to renew our conceptions are far too deeply involved in parliamentary disputes to find the necessary time to prepare a new world for new men. Neither will the creative impulse from which a new economic order may emerge subjected to man, serving his highest aims and safe-guarding the rights of his personality, come from the communists or from André Gide. For these are still discussing whether man ought to be rich or poor, a question which was solved 1934 years ago as we can read in a book which frightens them and which is called "The Gospel".

Students and Revolution in the U.S.A.

Francis A. HENSON

In designating time in relationship to the rise of a revolutionary temper among students, in the United States, one might date this article 5 A.D. The initials do not refer to Latin words but mean, "After (the great) Depression : 1929 ". There were active socialist and communist groups existent before the present crisis, but they were relatively non-influential. No one had heard of anything like a fascist student group on this side of the Atlantic. Any Marxist will understand this correlation between this devastating world crisis of capitalism, in the midst of which we now are, and the development in the United States for the first time in its history, on such a large scale, of revolutionary movements among students. This is the first major crisis of declining capitalism in the United States. The frontier has been exhausted and new avenues for capital investment under capitalism are progressively more limited.

Although this revolutionary outlook is not qualitatively new in the United States, it is a new development in a quantitative sense. There were revolutionary students in 1776 and 1865 as well as other crucial periods. However, inter-collegiate political life was as negligible as industrial monopolies in those days and the revolutionary expression was usually exceedingly individualistic and consequently often a Walt Whitman brand of anarchism or literary bohemianism. The inexorable economic processes had not yet given birth to the intellectual proletariat. Every white-collar worker who wanted a job could get one.

Another factor that partly accounts for but mainly reveals the present revolutionary upsurge among an increasingly large minority is the cultural and religious change which is quite marked even among sections of the majority of students. There is a new longing for authority, discipline and an order-

ing of life. This is in marked contrast to the student outlook during the rebellious decade 1920-1930. These after-the-war days were days of self-emancipation, prohibition, gin parties, the flapper contortionist dances (the more preposterous wriggles and posing the better the dance !), anti-compulsory college chapel campaigns (I managed one myself as editor of a college paper in the early '20's, so I know) and discussion groups that pooled ignorance. The present college generation, as a whole, is much more sedate. The run-of-the-mine average group, which is the majority, is more serious, prefers to dance more stately waltz tunes and, in the American tradition of mass education, mainly for social prestige, resists genuine scholarship. One wing of it even leans towards "preserving the traditions of the Old South" or whatever other tradition happens to represent the *status quo* of the day-before-yesterday. Only in two cases — Vanderbilt University and Columbia University — have the *laissez-faire* conservatives already turned into near-revolutionists of a fascist variety and organised for action. It is another wing, also a minority, which provides personnel for the growing revolutionary socialist and communist student movements. The important point is that wherever revolutionary sentiment has cropped out, it has been encouraged by the general intellectual atmosphere of this decade even in libertarian America. And the tendency toward authoritarianism, dictatorship and cultural totalitarianism is growing in very subtle ways. Its continued growth is guaranteed by the inevitability of economic collectivism of some kind, particularly in the United States where the rationalisation of industry with consequent plenty has surpassed all other countries except perhaps Japan.

It may be asked on the basis of this analysis : Why did not the pre-war or pre-20th century students become revolutionists in any significant number ? The answer is that the traditions which the pre-war student accepted were individualistic to their core and that such traditions and the war experience (socially and culturally symptomatic of disintegrating capitalism, incidentally) bore as their fruit the futilitarianism of the 1920's. Today the attempt to get one's feet on firmer

ground than the bourgeois spirit has produced, drives some of the minority to classicism, Roman Catholicism or fascism, or to what may be called the "new orthodoxy", and others to Marxism. In both cases the basic attitude is revolutionary in the sense that there is a desire for a complete discontinuous break with the bourgeois and liberal tradition.

From my standpoint as a Marxist, I believe that the genuinely revolutionary students who follow the leadership of the economic and political fascists are being sadly fooled. It is a tragedy that students and working people in Germany believe that Hitler is going to build a *new world order*, while he is quite definitely moving Germany back toward the Middle Ages. In this direction lies the destruction of much that we have struggled for years to achieve. In this direction, also, lies a terrible, catastrophic world war.

In the United States, the hopeful part of the present political picture is the increasing strength of student Marxist groups and the very small growth of organised student fascist sentiment. From this year forward, however, it seems probable that the race is on between socialism and fascism to capture the allegiance of students and the general population. The appearance of the demagogic Hitler-like William Dudley Pelley and his Silver Legion, the activities of the brilliant Lawrence Dennis, editor of the avowedly fascist *Awakener*, the writings of the literary Seward Collins and his disciples, as well as the influence of the economically fascist-inclined N. R. A., all point in the direction of fascism becoming a serious contender for power in the United States.

Why has this formidable group of forces not made more headway in the sense of winning more vigorous advocates in the colleges? The answer is, in the first place, because it has just this year come upon the political stage in a definite way. A more important answer for the future is that for more than a quarter of a century there has been quietly but persuasively working in the colleges what was at first called, the *Intercollegiate Socialist Society*, founded by Upton Sinclair, Jack London and others, and more recently called *The League for Industrial Democracy*. The directors of this organisation are Norman Thomas and Dr. Harry Laidler. Thomas is the

outstanding leader of the present Socialist Party and Laidler is one of the ablest economists in the United States, highly respected even by non-socialists. The influence of the L. I. D. has been very great in conditioning the thinking of thousands of the present professors of social science, while they were still undergraduates. It continues to be the largest radical student organisation. It is true that in the main its emphasis has been a social democratic rather than a revolutionary socialist one. However, it has prepared many for the revolutionary position which they now take. Furthermore, the Student Council of the League for Industrial Democracy at its recent convention adopted a programme which differs little from that of the *National Student League*, the communist student organisation. The N. S. L. is just three years old. It is one of the many special semi-controlled organisations of the Communist Party which welcomes into membership all in its functional category who are willing to work under its direction regardless of their political affiliations. Although it has a very inadequate office and no paid staff and fewer local units than the L. I. D. it is very aggressive and heartily joins in united front activities with the L. I. D. and other student organisations. Like the L. I. D., it publishes a monthly magazine of considerable literary merit.

An example of the work of both of these organisations is the united front student strike against war in which many colleges throughout the United States participated on April 13, the anniversary week of the entrance of the United States into the World War. About 25,000 students and faculty took part in these demonstrations. At Vassar a parade of five hundred students was led down the main streets of Poughkeepsie by President MacCracken. At the College of the City of New York, there was a near riot when the Dean tried to break up the meeting. Elsewhere, for instance at Harvard, there were counter-demonstrations by those who wished to make fun of this concern about politics or by the militaristically inclined students. The strike was reported in headlines and on the front pages of newspapers and in most cases it received respectful although highly critical editorial comment. The united front was supported by the youth

section of the *American League against War and Fascism* which takes a revolutionary Marxist position. Although the L.I.D. does not belong to this communist-oriented anti-war league, it finds no difficulty in accepting its position. This basic theoretical agreement on war explains why the L.I.D. and N.S.L. were able to carry through successfully this united front. In many cases, of course, the radical student organisations were able to make this demonstration as impressive as it was because they could enlist many non-members who are strongly opposed to the vast war preparations of the Roosevelt government.

Another example of the work of these revolutionary student groups was the National Conference of Students on Politics, held in Washington during the Christmas holidays of 1933. This conference was called by the most comprehensive grouping of national student organisations ever cooperating on a single project in recent years. The Student Y.W.C.A. and Y.M.C.A. heartily supported it and the administrative secretary was Kenneth Holland, American secretary of International Student Service. When the conference convened in Washington, the issue was whether the delegates assembled should adopt a strong platform against war, for racial equality and for basic social changes, or whether it should just remain an annual student conference on politics in general without a platform. The group supporting the latter position were known to be actively pro-N.R.A., interested in utilising the organisation to form a thinly disguised Roosevelt student movement, or were playing with the idea of some suspiciously fascist-like America-centered youth movement. By a combination of the L.I.D., N.S.L. and Student Christian Associations the fairly left wing programme was adopted. This conference illustrated the support which most members of the Christian Associations are now giving to an essentially socialist as over against a fascist position. Practically all staff members of the Student Y.W.C.A. and Y.M.C.A. are members or cordial sympathisers of the L.I.D. and many of them, without too much political astuteness, would say that they would like to see the L.I.D. and N.S.L. combined into one organisation. This almost axiomatic assumption by

Student Christian Association secretaries and leaders that revolutionary socialism is the most adequate political expression of Christianity today, is one of the most hopeful signs that the cultural and religious cleavage which exists in Europe between Marxist and religious groups is largely absent in our colleges. This is even more significant in the United States, however, than in Europe in the fight against fascism. For our Protestant religious pattern is so pervasive in its influence that if this recruiting ground for fascism can be captured by the socialists before the fascists organise widely, the battle will be half won. The other side of this coin is that this collaboration between socialist and Student Christian Association groups has sent into the leadership of the L.I.D. and some of the communist groups a surprising number of men and women with Student Christian Movement experience.

Although it is evident that the official Communist Party has not yet attracted many religiously oriented persons into its membership, there are tendencies in some of its organisational and literary efforts toward a sympathetic consideration of the age-old problems of belief, faith and motivation. A recent article in *The New Masses*, a communist literary journal, on "Something to Believe In" by Rebecca Pitts is quite striking in its religiousness though it expresses itself in terms of naturalistic faith. While it is attacked vigorously by mechanistic Marxists, its very publication and the approving letters printed suggest something of the cultural flexibility which is beginning to characterise Marxism in America.

Another student organisation which should be mentioned in an article covering the whole field of revolutionary tendencies among students is *Young America*. The true nature of this group is not yet clear. There are those who believe it to be headed inevitably in a fascist direction. It seeks to be "American", does not take the class struggle seriously and plays up to the middle class. It is one of the organisations which strenuously oppose the action taken at the Conference of Students on Politics. It is interested in attracting revolutionary-minded youth and has no immediate demands. Its programme declares that nothing can be done until there has

been a transfer of power to trained people who will administer a planned society in the interest of the total good.

Other tendencies in the general revolutionary movement which some L.I.D. and Student Christian Association members support are the American Workers Party, largely a group of able trade union organisers with a communist outlook and sympathetic intellectuals, the Communist Party Opposition (Lovestonites), the Communist League (Trotsky followers) and the Revolutionary Policy Committee of the Socialist Party which is an increasingly definite crystallisation of the left revolutionary sentiment in the Socialist Party with a position comparable to that of the I.L.P. in Great Britain. None of these tendencies, however, have special student organisations comparable to the L.I.D. or N.S.L.

One observation which readers of this article in Europe and Asia may well make is that the present Recovery Administration does not seem to have captured student interest in terms of an organisation in any sense comparable to the Storm Troopers of Hitler or Black Shirts of Mussolini. This is a correct observation and an important one in the light of the assumptions of the foreign press that the "Roosevelt Revolution" is a genuine revolution. Tremendous changes toward industrial monopolisation have gone forward under the N.R.A. There has been remarkable political improvisation and the term "revolution" has been popularised. But students who think and intellectuals in general have become progressively less enthused about Roosevelt's tight-rope walking tactics when they were not from the first antagonistic to the reforms — petty at best — which Roosevelt has astutely sponsored.

L'Appel du Fascisme à la Jeunesse

ALBERTO SIBILLE

Quand il s'agit d'examiner les motifs profonds d'un mouvement et les moyens dont il entend se servir pour attirer l'attention de la jeunesse et susciter son ardeur et son enthousiasme, il est toujours facile de tomber dans de vagues généralisations, vides de tout contenu réel et effectif. On peut dire, d'une façon très sommaire, que toute révolution, c'est-à-dire tout changement profond et radical dans la vie et dans l'organisation d'une collectivité, attire, par sa nature même, la jeunesse, toujours avide de sensations nouvelles et prête à combattre l'ordre établi. Il ne serait même pas difficile de baser sur ce fait une certaine philosophie de l'histoire, déjà développée par l'italien Vico qui voyait dans les « *corsi e ricorsi* » l'éternelle balançoire capable d'expliquer les progrès et les reculs apparents de la vie des peuples.

Mais mieux vaut laisser de côté ces considérations générales et arriver tout de suite aux motifs réels et spécifiques qui nous semblent expliquer l'adhésion presque totale de la jeunesse — et surtout de la jeunesse intellectuelle — au fascisme.

La jeunesse italienne, comme celle des autres nations, réagit contre toute forme d'idéal abstrait. Elle est assoiffée des réalités concrètes. Les paroles, les vagues promesses ou les appels à des programmes nébuleux et indéfinis ne la satisfont plus. Le fascisme est réalisateur ; il ne se contente pas de prêcher et de promettre ; il agit ; les projets se réalisent dans toutes sortes de domaines ; c'est une action constante qui donne des résultats concrets, visibles et tangibles. Cela constitue pour la jeunesse — qui cherche le concret — un appel puissant et efficace.

Dans une époque fatiguée et agitée comme la nôtre il est facile de comprendre que les idées d'ordre et de discipline prônées par le fascisme exercent une grande influence sur la

jeunesse. Contrairement à la génération précédente les jeunes d'aujourd'hui aiment à se sentir protégés par ce nouveau paternalisme de l'Etat et de la Nation qui leur offre un asile sûr et tranquille et un rendement plus complet de toutes les activités, organisées et coordonnées en vue d'un but commun. L'individu n'est plus sollicité par différents courants d'opinion qui le poussent dans les directions les plus opposées. Il trouve sa place dans une unité à laquelle le lient des liens bien plus profonds et vitaux que ceux qui peuvent le rallier à un simple parti politique.

En outre, la jeunesse italienne est encadrée dans des formations de caractère militaire dont les fréquentes parades et revues en uniforme lui donnent la sensation visible de la force du nombre et de la discipline, sans réclamer toutefois d'elle un servilisme absolu. Car, en dépit des cadres et de la discipline extérieure, le moi intérieur reste libre de juger et de penser selon son point de vue particulier. En Italie, la collectivité protège mais n'étouffe pas l'individu ; au contraire, on peut constater que le jeune Italien, tout naturellement imbu des nouvelles théories, fasciste on pourrait dire de naissance, est plus libre de faire entendre son point de vue particulier que son aîné, toujours suspect d'appartenir à l'opposition anti-fasciste.

Le fascisme est ancré dans la tradition ; il n'a pas, comme le communisme, la prétention de détruire tous les liens avec le passé ni de tout reconstruire *ab imis fundamentis* ; il se proclame l'héritier et le continuateur de la gloire de Rome. Cette évocation constante lui donne une base historique stable, en augmentant le prestige de la nation qui se présente au monde, sous l'emblème des faisceaux de Rome, avec un aspect de plus grande unité et de dignité qui flatte naturellement l'amour-propre de la jeunesse.

La jeunesse jouit aussi sous le régime fasciste de facilités et de possibilités inconnues dans le passé. Dès son inscription, à l'âge de 6 ans, dans l'*Opera Nazionale Balilla*, et jusqu'à la fin de ses études universitaires, le jeune fasciste peut prendre part à de nombreux camps d'été à la montagne et au bord de la mer ; (on prévoit 500.000 inscriptions dans le courant de cet été) aux croisières maritimes dans la Méditerranée et ailleurs.

(les groupes universitaires fascistes organisent, pour le mois de septembre, une tournée de plusieurs centaines d'étudiants aux Etats-Unis) ; sans compter les nombreux concours qui ont lieu pendant toute l'année et culminent généralement dans une visite au Duce.

La jeunesse également découvre sa valeur non seulement dans le domaine politique et dans celui de l'éducation physique et des sports, mais aussi dans le domaine économique et culturel. Jamais on n'a assisté à pareille floraison de journaux et de revues, dirigées par les jeunes, par exemple *l'Anno XIII*, organe des lycéens d'Italie, dirigé par un des fils de Mussolini, âgé de 17 ans — discute librement et avec une grande désinvolture toutes les questions intéressant la vie italienne. Les grands quotidiens ouvrent volontiers des pages entières aux étudiants qui y expriment leurs jugements et leurs points de vue avec une sûreté et un aplomb ignorés jusqu'ici. La voix des jeunes s'est fait entendre à plusieurs reprises à la radio, lors de la préparation des *Littoriali* de la culture et de l'art qui ont dernièrement groupé à Florence des centaines d'étudiants venus de toutes les universités d'Italie et ont constitué un événement considérable. A la Chambre des Députés, comme aux principaux leviers de commande du régime, une très large part est faite aux jeunes qui sentent et apprécient ce privilège.

Parmi les motifs d'ordre plus intime rappelons l'appel à une vie individuelle plus simple et plus saine qui offre au jeune homme une vision joyeuse et optimiste de la vie et élimine le danger d'un pessimisme destructeur. Il n'y a guère de traces en Italie — du moins en apparence — de ce sentiment de révolte et de mécontentement radical de la jeunesse, si prononcé dans tant de pays. A côté des études, les sports et l'éducation physique largement encouragés aident les jeunes à éliminer tous les poisons de la civilisation moderne.

Notons aussi l'appel constant à l'optimisme, à la confiance en soi, à la valeur des forces morales pour surmonter tous les obstacles. Et encore l'appel à la puissance et à la gloire de l'Italie, à la revendication de ce que le fascisme regarde comme les droits inaliénables de la nation, comme sa force grandissante, sa capacité de développement, sa volonté

d'enseigner quelque chose de nouveau, d'indiquer les routes sur lesquelles l'Europe entière — d'aucuns disent le monde — devra tôt ou tard s'acheminer, pour sortir du chaos actuel. Et enfin l'appel constant à servir une cause supérieure à l'intérêt particulier ; une cause qui réclame une adhésion totale — du corps et de l'esprit — un appel à la vie héroïque, à la lutte qui ne soit pas fondée uniquement sur la force brutale, mais sur une tension idéale, sur un enthousiasme permanent qui doit inlassablement se transmettre d'année en année en se renouvelant sans cesse. Tel est le sens profond des grandes levées fascistes par exemple où les aînés transmettent solennellement les emblèmes de leur groupement aux plus jeunes par le symbole de l'accolade fraternelle qui représente l'unité idéale de toute la jeunesse fasciste. Tel aussi le sens des mots d'ordre qui lui sont donnés et qu'elle accepte avec une discipline consciente et totale : « Croire, obéir, combattre » et « Livre et Mousqueton ».

Enfin le facteur, peut-être le plus important, décisif, c'est le charme et l'autorité personnels de Mussolini. La jeunesse sait qu'elle est son amour et sa joie. Il voit en elle la réalisation complète, la continuation de sa doctrine, un terrain vierge et fertile sur lequel il est possible de bâtir à nouveau, sans les entraves et les décombres du passé. L'aspect du Duce, souvent sérieux et sévère lorsqu'il s'adresse aux personnes d'âge mûr, s'illumine et devient souriant lorsqu'il paraît au milieu de la jeunesse ; on dirait que celle-ci a toujours le pouvoir de lui transmettre son optimisme et sa foi dans l'avenir.

Voici, à ce propos, le témoignage tout récent et significatif d'un étudiant, publié le 8 juin par l'un des principaux quotidiens de Rome sous le titre : *Près de Mussolini*. « ... Mon histoire est un peu l'histoire de tout le monde. Nous nous sentons attachés à Lui jusqu'à l'extrême sacrifice, nous avons grandi en chantant Son nom et nous avons vécu dès notre enfance dans cette atmosphère qu'Il nous a créée. » (Les majuscules sont dans l'original).

« Notre plus grand désir à nous, les jeunes, c'est de lui parler de tout près, d'entendre ses paroles encourageantes, de lui dire de vive voix que tous les jeunes d'aujourd'hui sont à

lui, prêts à le suivre toujours et partout avec enthousiasme. Une foi et un dévouement qui n'ont rien à envier aux « squadristi » de la veille. La masse universitaire — sans exception — est entièrement à ses ordres ; elle a l'esprit formé et le corps prêt à recevoir — afin de le perpétuer — l'héritage des conquêtes de la révolution. Les étudiants italiens savent que le Duce les suit, les encourage et les aime. C'est cet intérêt qui les pousse à se maintenir toujours sur la voie de l'action et à se perfectionner chaque jour davantage. Entre les étudiants et le Duce il y a une relation vivante et continuelle : même de loin il est toujours présent ; et non seulement il ne perd jamais les contacts avec les plus jeunes, mais il les établit directement, sans se servir des générations intermédiaires. Nous sommes fiers de ces relations et nous voulons qu'elles continuent toujours. »

Comme ces lignes le prouvent, l'élément strictement personnel, humain, affectif, joue un rôle de tout premier plan dans l'enthousiasme de la jeunesse pour le fascisme.

Summary

Italian youth, as youth of other countries, reacts against abstract ideals and is hungry for concrete reality. And fascism offers precisely concrete plans and projects rather than vague promises. At the same time the very uncertainty of life today makes it comprehensible that ideas of order and discipline, such as fascism proclaims, have a great influence on youth. Young people like to feel themselves protected in order to be able to give themselves wholly for the realization of a common aim.

The military formations with their frequent parades give youth the sensation of being part of a great indestructible force. This does not, however, mean complete subservience, for inwardly all remain free to think according to their own predilections. In Italy the collectivity protects but does not smother the individual. In fact a young Italian who has been brought up as a fascist, is freer to express himself than those of the older generation who may always be suspected of belonging to the anti-fascist opposition.

Fascism is built on the great tradition of Rome and does not want to reconstruct from the very bottom upward. This gives it a stability and dignity which again attracts youthful sympathies.

In many ways the fascist *régime* gives new opportunities to youth. From the moment of entering into the *Opera Nazionale Balilla* at the age of six until the end of his university studies, the young fascist can take part in all sorts of activities. There are 500.000 registrations for the Mediterranean cruises this summer and fascist student groups are organising a tour of hundreds of students to the United States.

In the cultural realm there is more life than there has ever been. In the periodical of the high-school boys, directed by a son of Mussolini of 17 years of age, one finds free discussion of all public questions. Again the great dailies often discuss student problems and invite students to express themselves in their pages. In political life also youth has more opportunities than before.

The result is that there is less of the sentiment of revolt and radical discontent among Italian youth than among their colleagues of other countries. Youth is constantly being challenged to optimism and self-confidence and to the service of the glory of Italy with its growing power and its capacity for showing the way out of the present chaos for Europe as a whole. There is in this not merely an appeal to complete sacrifice but also to a constantly renewed idealism and enthusiasm. The slogan is "Believe, obey and struggle".

But perhaps the most important and decisive factor is the personal charm and authority of Mussolini. In him youth sees the complete realisation of fascist doctrine. The face of the Duce which is serious and often severe when he deals with older people, becomes friendly and smiling when he appears among the young. It is as if youth communicates its optimism and faith in the future to him.

In a recent article in one of the main newspapers a student writes: "Our greatest desire is to come in touch with him, to hear his encouraging words, to tell him that our whole generation belongs to him and is willing to follow him everywhere with enthusiasm. Italian students know that the Duce follows them, encourages them and loves them. Between the students and their Duce is a living and continuous relationship; even if he is far away he is present. We are proud of these relations and want to have them last for ever". These lines show that the strictly personal and human element plays a very large rôle in the enthusiasm of youth for the fascist cause.

British University Students and the Class War

EDWIN BARKER

There is no doubt that the political situation in the British universities has undergone a great change since 1926. This was the year of the General Strike and numbers of students took part in carrying on "essential services" during the strike. The organised opposition to this action on the part of students was very weak indeed and only made itself felt in a few university centres. The situation now is such that the students whose sympathies are on the side of the workers can readily express their sympathy in very practical form. An instance occurred a short while ago during an unofficial dockers' strike. One group of students went to the docks to help in the unloading of goods and another went to join the workers and to prevent work going on in the docks. Other examples indicating the same kind of fundamental change in the British universities could be quoted. The isolation of the student is ended and his active participation in politics in the worker's interest is a new fact. The idea that students are politically separate from the world of strikes and politics is rejected, and in some cases students take the initiative. When the grants towards education were reduced, a group of students led a protest and were followed by large numbers of teachers and parents.

This situation is met by the university authorities seeking to encourage a dispassionate study of politics and giving facilities for this to happen. This is construed by Marxist students as sabotage; it is considered merely a trick to keep students quiet, and especially to prevent their organising or taking part in demonstrations and similar activities. The truth of the situation is difficult, if not impossible to arrive at. Marxist students begin from the assumption that university authorities are incapable of being persuaded to

grant concessions of their own free will, and consequently persuasion is never attempted. In all cases where the university authorities have acted against Marxist and anti-war groups, there has been no alternative. The student societies concerned have always deliberately created a situation in which the authorities had, of necessity, to act against the societies.

That the activities in which politically left-wing students take an active part are causing unrest in governmental circles is evident from recent attempted legislation, in particular the much disputed and now emasculated Incitement to Disaffection Bill. This bill in its original form gave enormously wide powers to the government to act against such activities as the Anti-War Society, and the Marxist groups and, had it been adopted in this form, bodies like the Student Christian Movement would have been in danger of government intervention. Its present form is dangerous enough but it is now a comparatively weak bill. As a sign of the times, the original bill is of great significance.

The Marxist groups in the universities are, on the whole, small, intellectually competent, vocal and enthusiastic. Their effect is out of all proportion to their numerical strength. In one northern university two students, eventually followed by two hundred more, gave more publicity to political opinion amongst students than all the political society conferences held by the official societies. These two were Marxist by conviction.

The real political conflict in the universities is between these small and active communist groups and those who, whilst left-wing in political sympathy, are prepared to pursue more parliamentary methods to achieve their ends. An exception is the Fascist Movement which is still very small, but definitely growing in strength in a few university centres.

The most significant feature of the past few years, however, is the growth of a well organised active body of students who are prepared to break through the isolation of the university student from politics and take their stand, in a crisis, by the side of the workers. It is not without significance that the only student political journal of any importance is *The Student Vanguard*, the organ of the communist groups.

Thoughts on the Christian Revolution

JACQUES MARITAIN

That the world has entered into a revolutionary period is a fact which we can but accept. There is, therefore, good reason to say that one is a revolutionary so as to indicate that one is ready to move on the level of this new situation.

*
* *

The drawback of the word revolution and of the pictures which it calls to our minds is not that it makes us think of a too great or too radical transformation but, on the contrary, of a transformation confined to great events of a purely outward character and to secondary principles; of a sudden commotion the radicalism of which, because of its exterior and material character, is only a mask for the absence of essential and spiritual depth, in short of a purely material change. The world demands transformations which are something more than what Lucien Bonaparte has called "the turning over of the dung-hill".

*
* *

This would seem to imply that it is more important to be a revolutionary than to call oneself a revolutionary, especially in times when revolution has become the most "conformist" of the common-places and a title claimed by everybody. To get rid of this phraseology would perhaps be a useful act of "revolutionary courage".

*
* *

That far-reaching transformations are inevitable is a fact which is independent of the will of our generation, for this general need of radical change has come into being apart from our intentions. Neither does it depend on our will that according to the logic of failure in history and according to the inevitable inclination of human frailty and

of the law of least resistance, all these potential forces tend toward crystallisations of an inferior character. The question remains, however, whether there is not a possibility of another type of crystallisation in which the forces of creation and renewal, which are also inherent in human history and which could direct on these general tendencies and potentialities, could express themselves. And this certainly depends on the will of our generation, for it depends on the availability and action of some men, of some heroic souls, if we can find them, and of some men of genius if we can find them.

*
* *

The Christian renewal of the world, however small the probability of its success seems in view of the present obstacles to it, *can* succeed. The mere possibility of it is sufficient to make it reasonable for men of action to choose it as their aim. And if it fails, it is impossible that it should completely fail, for at least the witness which it bears will abide.

■
* *

From the point of view of historical reality the chief thing is not to succeed (which is never abiding), but simply to have existed (which is indelible).

*
* *

A Christian renewal of the world demands at the same time that human beings will commit themselves with all their energies to its success and that they will nevertheless remain detached from its success, detached not because of their indifference but because of their magnanimity, not because of their poverty but because of the abundance of their love, in short detached but committed. This detachment from visible results means for the man of action the bearing of a cross. But to work for the Christian renewal in this world without doing it as a Christian would be to spoil it while bringing it into being. This is the most treacherous way of betraying one's mission.

*
* *

"The pure are the strong". This word of Zola summarises the law of efficiency in all processes of renewal in history. It is necessary for those who would introduce a Christian world order to measure the tremendous implications of this law for themselves. The purity of a Saint Just or of a Lenin is already quite uncommon in their realm of life and it is something relatively easy compared with the purity which is demanded from Christians and of which they know the name.

*
* *

From the point of view of the deeper meaning of history one may take it that the war of the Soviets against God with all its apparatus of lies and foolishness is a sign of a divine indignation which permits this blasphemy of frank negation in order to clear away the blasphemy of affirmation which had become falsehood in the mouths of too many so-called Christians.

*
* *

There are in a time like ours two opposite dangers for the Christian community: On the one hand the danger of expressing the heroism which it owes to the world merely in the cloister of inner life and of private virtues, on the other hand the danger of conceiving heroism, as soon as it enters into social life and begins to transform it, in terms of its materialist opponents, that is in a purely exterior way.

*
* *

Christian heroism has not the same source as other forms of heroism, for it proceeds from the heart of a God who has been flogged, ridiculed and crucified outside the city gates. It is time that it should again, as formerly in mediaeval times, become concerned with the life of the present order, but knowing well that its strength and its greatness come from elsewhere, that is from a quite different order. It is possible that before the return of Christ it may again witness visible victories in the present order. For the moment, however,

it is very evident and a scandal for many that visible greatness and the shouts and triumphs of victory are on the side of the enemy : impure greatness, but nevertheless greatness, such as the flesh and the world can produce them. The adventure of the Five Year Plan and of the March on Rome are quite equivalent to the statue of Nebuchadnezzar.

*
* *

[It will be asked of the political and social groups led by Christians — if they can ever be brought into being — to work first if all on the spiritual plane and to struggle with the arms of Christian heroism, that is of saintliness. This apparent paradox will only be incomprehensible to those who have not yet understood that the evils inherent in human society today are incurable if divine life is not carried into the very depth of human life itself, into the sphere of the secular and of the profane. God has formerly called forth saints to be military or national leaders, emperors or kings. Why should He not call forth saints who could be political leaders in the conditions of our time or of future times ?

*
* *

The purity of human revolutions is qualified by much moral pollution. The purity of a Christian renewal permits only means which are pure in themselves.

*
* *

A Christian revolution can only succeed by means which the others would be incapable to use.

*
* *

If Christians who are men of faith in their private life begin to forget their faith as soon as they are concerned with matters of social and political life, they will simply remain slaves dragged along by the historical development.

*
* *

Nature does not forgive those who fail in carrying out the specific laws of their being. And the Christian is forced

to look very high for his specific law of action which in the social order separates him both from the laws inherent in a revolution of hate and from those inherent in an order of greed.

*
* *

We must denounce what might be called the myth of insurrection, the idea that the great social operations and the great historic transformations, the great revolutions are always in their essence operations of war or of insurrection against a certain established order or disorder and that they exist fundamentally in overcoming or destroying an obstacle.

*
* *

These last operations which might be called Caesarean operations are sometimes necessary. But the normal development is that when the human fruit has arrived at maturity, the forces of nature open up the maternal womb. Similarly the great operations of history and the great revolutions result normally from the fact that the new order has formed itself.

Such a process presupposes much greater human effort and energy : the means which it requires are not the *means of war* or of struggle *against* an enemy to be overcome or an obstacle to be removed, but rather the *means of organic construction*, of the struggle for something new, *for* a reality to be created and brought into being.

*
* *

These last are especially the proper means for a Christian renewal of society. These constructive means are the peculiar means for the Christian, because it is natural to the Christian to be creative and to collaborate with the creative forces in history. These means demand from those who adopt them a sacred anonymity and this again is peculiar to the Christian who is able to say : *non nobis Domine* , which is so hard to the pagan heart.

*
* *

Christians find in history many more successes and victories than it would seem from the outside, for they see successes of this particular character, that is victories of construction, which are in a sense hidden by the very means which have brought them into being.

*
* *

The conflict between the exigencies of Christian ethics and those of human success is only an apparent conflict, for the constructive means are in reality more important for new creation in history than the means of war, especially than the means of physical war.

*
* *

Are the arms of construction the only ones which it is permissible for a Christian to use ? In view of the development of the technique of means of physical war, such as the modern world has produced, is the Christian not to use any means of war ? Although the means of war are in themselves not the most important, they remain necessary. Human history cannot do without them. They play often a decisive rôle in the final stage of a historical drama.

*
* *

But there are other means of war than the *physical* means of war. If the *spiritual* means of war would prove sufficiently strong arms, then the conflict would be lifted to a different level and new solutions would emerge.

*
* *

If we call in a general way means of war all such means as are available to man to remove obstacles or to resist a force which tends to break him, then one is led on to the discovery that there are two types of means of war just as there are two types of force or of courage : the courage to attack and the courage to endure, the force of pressure, of an aggressiveness and the force of patience, the force to inflict

suffering upon others and the force to accept suffering for oneself.

*
* *

If it is true that there is no redemption without the shedding of blood then it must be so that in the last analysis there are but two types of means of war in the fight against the evils of the world, the one which leads in case of necessity to take the blood of others, the other to give one's own blood.

*
* *

Let us imagine a political brotherhood of men who would decide to take up (with necessary modifications in so far as they may have to use the means of war), the methods of the Christians of former times and of the apostles of all times. They would use above all the means which we have called means of organic construction and would, for instance, attempt (whatever may be the situation of the struggle between the parties for the government of the state) to create in the nation new organs and new forms of political and economic life. But they would not only use all the ordinary means to which they are legally entitled and which are not strictly speaking means of war. If necessary they carry on war by voluntary suffering; they practice poverty; they accept ignominious burdens willingly; they stand openly for the truth whether it is popular or unpopular and refuse in certain cases to cooperate in public life or take certain types of initiative outside the law, not in order to disorganise the state or to endanger its life¹, but to achieve the abrogation of an unjust law, to witness for a right, to impose changes which reason has discovered to be necessary, to prepare slowly the transformation of the present order until the moment comes when the responsibility will be in their own hands. All these physical acts are for them only test cases of a spiritual life which is orientated towards the perfection of the soul. In suffering patiently the bad treatment which

¹ The systematic refusal of military service such as practiced by conscientious objectors proceeds from a simplistic ideology mixed up with illusions. It is not truly effective against the evil of war and risks to endanger the life of the community in cases when a just war must be fought.

is inflicted upon them, they try to remain without hate or without pride. They exert severe control over themselves in order that they may not fail in the cause of justice ; they do not admit that lying or anything else which is degrading should spoil their actions ; they love those truly against whom they struggle just as they love those truly for whom they struggle ; all the evil which is done to them is absorbed in their love ; before they witness outwardly against evil love has burned it away in their hearts. Their influence on the world would be great !

*
* *

It is an illusion that true prudence consists in not asking man to do difficult things. The paradox of human nature is that in spite of its weakness and frailty it tends more easily to the super-human than to the human.

*
* *

To exclude the physical means in principle is equivalent to denying the reality of the body, or to imagining that most men act by reason. Constraint exists for the "insane" and the "insane" exist in much greater number than the wise men. Although the modern world has attempted to debase and dishonor force, just as it has attempted to debase and dishonor reason, force and reason as such remain uninfected. And just as faith can purify the use which we make of these, so faith can also restore their dignity.

*
* *

In certain particular political circumstances it will remain true that man of faith may have to fall back on force. Especially the possibility of the accession to power of a usurper and of lawful armed resistance against him is far from excluded in the present world situation.

*
* *

It must, however, always be as a method which is secondary and subordinate to the means of organic construction as

well as to the spiritual means of war, that aggressive force and the physical means of war should intervene.

*
* *

It is a presumption to try to force the situation and to "make revolution", that is one's own revolution. The greatest men are always disappointed in it and discover in the end that they have done something very different from what they wanted to do.

*
* *

Those who work in their place in the history which God initiates with man and of which He only knows the outcome, do always what they have wanted to do because it is not *their own* will which they want to accomplish.

*
* *

The world and our souls have entered into a zone of danger and of night in which the spirit of dizziness and other spirits of darkness of which St. John of the Cross speaks can easily assail us. But the same saint teaches us that the great nights of agony are also the nights of purification which introduce those who know how to profit from them to higher forms of life.

Christianity and Revolution

G. FEDOTOFF

The Two Meanings of "Revolution"

There are two ways to look upon and to define revolution : One is *social* or rather sociological, the other is *political*. Conceived as a sociological phenomenon, revolution is the radical change in social and political institutions, including both destruction of the old and reconstruction on new foundations. Conceived as a political phenomenon revolution is the acute struggle against the established *régime* in which large masses of the people take part on either side, so that civil war becomes inevitable. For civil war is the sign by which we recognise the real revolutions such as those which have taken place in England, France and Russia. The difference between civil war and revolution is that the first may be waged without revolutionary intentions, that is without the desire to destroy the established order. This is, for instance, the case in dynastic wars or wars of religion. But the political revolution is impossible without civil war, for civil war is the natural concomitant of its two main characteristics : the fever-heat of political passion and the number of the people which are drawn into the struggle.

These two forms of revolution do not necessarily coincide. There are revolutions in the life of the nations which are not accompanied by civil war or by revolt and in which the principle of legality and of the succession of governments is not violated. Such a revolution was, for instance, the industrial revolution in many countries during the last century, or the revolution in England which changed a *régime* of oligarchy into a complete democracy without insurrection or disorder of any great importance.

Unfortunately, however, these two different meanings of the word revolution lead to constant confusion in our time

and to the obscuring of the real moral issues with which the Christian is confronted. There can be no doubt that we need a reconstruction of society on a completely new basis. We long for regeneration, for a new society in which justice will reign and in which the worst injustices of the bourgeois world will be abolished. We believe, therefore, in a *social* revolution. But it is constantly being asserted that the *political* revolution is the only means at our disposal to reach this goal. Thus the confusion between the two types of revolution becomes inevitable. Even the most sincere Christians of our time let themselves be misled by this dangerous playing with words.

The Marxist Idol Worship of Revolution

The confusion between the two meanings of the word revolution is largely due to Marxism. Marx created a comprehensive sociological system, the starting point of which was a study of one particular historical event : the French Revolution. He gave a penetrating and brilliant analysis of the evils of his time and of the weakness and hypocrisy of capitalist society. But he went far beyond the limits of legitimate generalisation when he tried to force all of world history into a frame-work of " laws " which he had found in his study of industrial capitalism in the 19th century. His Hegelian rationalism and his materialist metaphysics falsified his living experience in a hopeless way. Concerning revolution he drew up the following sociological theory :

All history consists of class wars. The classes succeed each other and determine by their particular form of domination the whole system of culture, including religion. Each dominating class finishes by becoming rigid and reactionary and thus inevitably calls forth a violent taking of power by a new and more dynamic class. Revolution is therefore both a law and a condition of progress. Marx took as his concrete example of revolution the events of the years 1789-1801. Now it is evident that the revolution of 1789 helped powerfully to establish the bourgeois *régime* in France. But it should not be forgotten that the rise of the bourgeoisie

is a process which had lasted for ages, that is since the 11th or 12th century. Again in England the great revolution of 1648 is not the starting point of the bourgeois domination, for in that country the bourgeoisie only came to power in a very quiet way in the 19th century. Modern history knows of many civil wars and violent changes of government but none of these events resulted in the appearance or victory of an entirely new class.

It is even less true that revolution in the sense of civil war has been a dynamic factor of progress. On the contrary, the material destruction and the demoralisation which have accompanied all revolutions as well as the reactionary counter-currents which have followed them as their shadow, hold up progress and throw a whole generation back into the barbarism of the past. A very strong example is what happened to higher education during the religious wars at the time of the Reformation and during the French Revolution.

For Marx in his younger period as well as for his Russian disciples, the French Revolution was the model revolution which all proletarian revolutionaries should imitate. The extraordinary scope of the Red Terror in Russia was an outcome of the desire on the part of revolutionary leaders to imitate as closely as possible the methods of Marat whom they considered as their hero. It is true that when Marxism grew older in Germany, at the end of the last century, the Marxists, led by Engels, protested against the "vulgar" and bloody conception of revolution, they began to speak of revolution in a sociological sense (so that it might go together with evolution in the realm of politics) and Trotsky interpreted the dictatorship of the proletariat in a very innocent and humanitarian way. But words have a life of their own. When the historical events developed in the direction of revolution, the pseudo-scientific sociology of revolution was subordinated to the revolutionary mysticism of communism.

In spite of Marx and against Marx we must hold a very different conception of revolution. The revolution in the real and *political sense* of the word is not a normal phe-

nomenon or a factor of progress. It is rather a sign of the breakdown of the creative forces in society. Since these are too weak to reform and reorganise society, they make way for the elementary forces of destruction. Revolution is an elementary phenomenon comparable to a great flood or to an earthquake and as everything else in nature it is anti-cultural, that is to say it is reactionary in the literal sense of that word. Progressive ideas which accompany the revolutionary upheaval and the protestations of the so-called actors and leaders of the revolution should not deceive us, for it is merely a stage scenery which hides reality. In fact, the leaders are not the initiators but are being pushed by the unconscious stream. In which direction? Nearly always towards counter-revolution. And if in the following generation the social equilibrium is re-established and life triumphs again over death, if with a great effort men begin again to reconstruct with even greater zeal than their ancestors, as is natural for those who have escaped from great dangers, and are at last free from the revolutionary obsession, is it reasonable to attribute their energy to the revolution?

Concrete Revolution

Every moral question for the Christian should be dealt with concretely. Generalisations lead us astray. The question is not whether we accept the *idea* of revolution, abstractly conceived as the struggle for justice, but what revolution means in the concrete reality of life. The example of war provides a significant analogy. It is easy to justify a righteous war abstractly by drawing examples of wonderful heroism from classical and mediaeval history. But under the new circumstances created by modern technique the romantic attitude to war is hypocrisy. In the same way the real character of revolution is profoundly misunderstood if we look on it from a romantic viewpoint or from the viewpoint of abstract sociology. Let us see what revolution means in reality.

The typical revolution (in the *political* sense) is always prepared by idealists and ideologues, two types which should

not be confused. The cause of revolution contains always a strong element of idealism of a more or less utopian character. It is the contact of these dreams and criticisms with the sufferings of the people which sets the masses in motion and thus provides the indispensable factor for revolution. But for the masses everything depends on rights and self-interest and emotion take the place of ideas. As the revolutionary movement develops, the voice of passion based on hate becomes therefore louder and louder. When finally the old *régime* has been overthrown and the climax of the revolution has been reached, the storm of insolent passions breaks out. The idealists are left behind and make way for the demagogues who flatter and demoralise the people in order to master them. In the resulting chaos the general struggle leads to the victory of the strongest and least scrupulous. They exploit the revolutionary ideas to their own profit and build their career and fortune on a foundation of death and destruction. The worst period of tyranny comes back. The new masters covered by their authority as leaders or members of the party steal and murder to their heart's content. The people who have just been liberated find themselves again oppressed by tyrants who surpass their former masters in cruelty. And it is not only an affair of blood but also of filth : there is treason and spying and humiliation of the weak and lying — very specially a terrible amount of lying on the part of all those who would profit by the new situation. Those men who are truly devoted to the cause of revolution, who have sacrificed their whole life to it and who have been ready to go to prison or to the scaffold for the cause, find themselves condemned by traitors who have passed on in the last minute from the old to the new *régime* and are now proudly parading in the revolutionary ranks. Insincerity becomes general and takes on heart-breaking proportions. One can trust nobody and is overcome by the shame of it all. Finally the despotism of some dictator puts a stop to the infernal chaos. For despotism is the point to which every revolution, as if by definition, finally is driven. The ultimate outcome is the replacing of one ruling class by another, ruling by different principles

but in ways which are no more just or charitable than the old ones. For a very long period the revolution is followed by demoralisation and a deep division in the soul of the nation. A strong example is modern France since the revolution. Is the game worth the candle ?

The Eschatological Temptation

Even if one does not let oneself be deceived by the revolutionary illusion, there is another temptation for the Christian, namely to desire revolution as an expression of the wrath of God, as an anticipation of the Last Judgment and so to justify his own participation in it as an agent of divine displeasure. A real concern with the evils of our time and especially with social injustice creates often a deep passion of vengeance which may have noble and prophetic aspects but which leads in the soul of the revolutionary in the long run to terrible degeneration. Why is this attitude wrong in principle ?

Even if we accept that the terrible phenomenon called revolution is willed by God as a means to punish man, it is a crime to assume responsibility for executing this terrible judgment. St. Francis of Assisi has taught us that God uses for this purpose "the bad spirits". To assume the rôle of an instrument of divine vengeance is to assimilate oneself with the bad spirits, for the representatives of vengeance have always something demonic as we may see from Dostoievsky's novel *The Possessed*.

It is not a Christian attitude to desire or call upon the divine wrath. For the breakdown of the unjust society in floods of blood cannot make us rejoice, unless it is for the sake of bringing in the divine society. The revolutionaries who would represent "justice", always show a lack of love which makes them defenceless against the process of inner degradation. Pure justice in the form of vengeance is, as Byron has rightly stated, the pathos of the devil. We pray that God may remove His judgment from us and that He may treat us with the sublime injustice of forgiveness.

The Christian Duty

If the picture which I have given of revolution is not a caricature but a realistic portrait — and I am willing to bear witness that it is, for I have seen it with my own eyes and found my impressions confirmed by a study of history — then it follows in the first place that the Christian cannot really desire revolution or call it forth. Here we see the profound difference between revolution and all other forms of resistance of rebellion. Other forms of resistance may have to be accepted by the Christian in extreme cases with all the sin that they imply, even tyrannicide — but never revolution ! For revolution is not merely personal sin but the moral perversion of a whole nation and is worse than all evil against which it would provide the remedy.

But if that is agreed the problem is not yet fully solved. For revolution comes even if we do not desire it. It arrives as a natural catastrophe and we find ourselves 'suddenly face to face with it. What is the attitude of the Christian in the midst of such a situation ?

There are two possibilities. The first and obvious one is to retire from a society which is doomed to destruction. Thus Lot fled from Gomorrah. To escape from society does not necessarily mean to escape from humanity. In war there is a place for Red Cross work and the ministering to religious needs. Similarly in a time of civil war the need for charity is immense and the Christian is specially called to this form of service.

The other possibility is that after having reflected seriously and bitterly the Christian may find that he has to take sides. He wants to fight for justice and he is right in doing this, if he does not forget the power of sin. In that case without accepting the revolution and without desiring it, he chooses that side on which there is relatively speaking more justice as his conscience conceives of it, even if on that particular side he has to collaborate with men of great cruelty and outspoken godlessness. But he must know beforehand that he enters a blind alley and that he cannot gain the battle, for justice is never victorious in a revolution.

He must know that he sacrifices himself. Experience shows that the revolution swallows up its own children. Its gratitude and its laurels go only to the cowards. If the Christian in spite of all this is willing to die for the cause of justice, he is right in doing so. This also is a Christian way.

It must be said clearly that there is no third possibility. In other words the possibility of successful realisation through revolution does not exist for a Christian. For in the conditions which we have described, success is only possible at the price of denial of Christ.

Constructive Revolution

Let us now return to the second meaning of the word revolution: the constructive meaning, that is to say the total rebuilding of society. I am convinced that nothing except such a radical and complete remaking can save our sick society which is already falling to pieces. Sociologically speaking we live already in the midst of revolution in that sense of the word. To participate in the positive work of reconstruction is the first duty of the Christian in society. For his programmes he may have to go to the revolutionary parties. He will, however, be wise if he does not swallow them altogether and if he seeks with his fellow-Christians to state better issues and to discover better means of realising the goal. But conscious of the fact that the word revolution is ambiguous and that every moral ambiguity leads very easily to derailings, he will guard against decorating his activity with the revolutionary label. Let us leave the word to those who profit by its ambiguity!

For if we look at the substance of it, nothing is more definitely opposed to constructive action than the political and catastrophical revolution. As we have seen, such revolution means in essence that the negative forces, the forces of destruction, have got the upper hand over the creative forces.

It remains, however, true that social action on a large scale is today impossible without the participation of the masses and without in certain cases the use of violence.

There are, therefore, occasions when the constructive citizen is thrown together with the revolutionary on the dangerous stage of political struggle and sometimes their tactics may resemble each other. There remains, however, a fundamental difference, for the constructive leader will always be afraid of unloosening the masses. He would rather organise and discipline them and give them a sense of moral responsibility. He must therefore react against all demagoguery and all attempts to demoralise them.

And with regard to violence, if it cannot be completely excluded from the political realm, it must remain limited and purely technical. We must protest against the *spirit* of violence, the unlawful glorification of what is rather a tragic necessity. The choice of the means must remain with the leaders, with the statesmen. The masses should remain as free as possible from the passion of violence. The characteristic slogan of the constructive as over against the negative revolution is : " More conscience and less passion ! "

The Christian Attitude to Class War

JOHN B. GROSER

In this article we are not concerned with the whole system of Marx, but with that part of it which contains a statement of historical fact and which is something we can face and make up our minds about, in a sense, independently of Marxian philosophy.

For, however we may agree or disagree with economic determinism in the absolute and attempt to prove that it is only one fact of many ; however much we may argue that by itself it can produce no satisfactory solution for Christians because it is partial, we have to reckon with the fact that the prevailing method of production does create certain class divisions and that the capitalist system does, in fact, divide men into two categories : (a) those who live by the ownership and control of production, distribution and exchange ; and

(b) those whose only source of livelihood is in the sale of their labour power.

This class system exists. It does not necessarily produce a class war, but certainly a class division of society according to the method of making a livelihood. A barrier is thus erected between two classes of people which is primarily economic, but a cultural and social division follows as a matter of course. And it becomes intensified as the economic forms and methods of production advance.

The struggle for markets, the centralisation of capital and the rationalisation of industry tend to create a situation in which competition forces each side into closer union against the other and makes it more and more impossible for individuals on either side to act independently. Each is forced into his economic alignment and gradually class antagonism develops into open and continued class struggle. The capitalist class is forced to put pressure on the working class and the worker must retaliate as he becomes aware that the precarious nature of his life is the result of an out-worn system and that security can only be achieved by combination and expropriation. The outcome is class war.

What has the Christian to say to this? His task is to create a society which shall reflect God in human relationships. Class war exists because men have not fulfilled this task. It is the result of sin, and follows as the penalty of sin. There is, as it were, a secondary law of God, by which He has decreed that we cannot permanently organise sin. The system breaks down economically.

The whole race has sinned and has its part to play in recovery. As Christians we have a mission to all men, telling them everywhere to repent and to do God's Will. It should be possible, theoretically, to do by will what is necessary, but that is to reckon without sin and to minimise its results. It has so organised itself that man is in its chains and cannot see God and that he is too much involved in sin to obey God's Will. But the very fact of the class war, in God's providence, does make one class of people not only eager for change, but for a change which is generally in the direction of the externalisation of God's Will.

It is not accidental that the working class should believe that it is working for a universal brotherhood, however much this ideal is distorted by wrong and limited ideas. Here is our link with them. Insofar as we can take sides, it must be with them. Theirs is the injustice now, theirs is the least responsibility for the past and present, theirs is the only side in which all men can in the nature of the case be at one. To ask men to be de-classed and to live as brethren, is in fact what they are already forced to do.

In all probability the class war, if left to work itself out, does two things : firstly, it leads through a violent clash to the dictatorship of the proletariat and secondly, it creates a leadership built upon a denial of Christian values, which attempts to create a new society on the basis of violence, and of anti-Christian values and of a materialist philosophy.

And because many people are afraid of these results, they refuse to think any further. They see in imagination what will in all possibility happen by leaving the economic situation to work itself out, and refuse to act now in the light of that imagination. Do they realise that what they are imagining will come into being as an inevitable result of their own refusal to act now ? Too often do Christians either fold their hands in impotence or hide themselves behind a screen of other-worldliness. Too easily they succumb to bourgeois ideology and water down Christ's doctrine and practice to fit a world of sin. The result of our lack of challenge is seen in history. Because we have not willed to change, we are told we have no will to change. Because we have refused to let God act, we are told there is no God to act. Because we will not offer direction and principles for leadership, others have taken the initiative away from us. The criticism that we are generally behind, waiting to bless the victorious army and shirking the challenge to battle is not unfounded. We accept the *status quo* and seek shelter under its system of violence and wrong. We let it blow us economically where it will. We refuse to face the fact of change by maintaining that the Marxian will lead us nowhere because he has no eternal values, though we ourselves have denied him the values he needs for

the solution of his problem and though by our denial we have created the attitudes which we decried.

Our first duty is then with full recognition of the fact of sin to make our amend by identification insofar as possible with the suffering victims of the class system. I do not think of a theoretical identification but of a practical one. Only by so doing will we ever be able to offer what we have to give. We are not to take the attitude of a merely theoretical interest, but concern ourselves rather with the actual position of the people, who are forced economically to take sides in the war.

Christians must be one with the victims. Even a capitalist can make himself a victim by self-discipline and fellowship and by being ready voluntarily to cut the prop of privilege upon which he rests. Our identification with the working class has of course its limits, for we are in the first place Christians with an eternal message and we must not hide the fundamental differences which will arise between us and them if we find ourselves confronted with purely material leadership. Our identification is an alignment with a people, not a party.

The result of this general alignment will be to link us up naturally with most suffering causes. We will find in general that anti-imperialism springs from the sufferings of working people. In that we are at one with them. Furthermore strikes, hunger-marches, lock-outs, unemployed demonstrations, these are nearly always the outcome of some injustice to the people and give us an opportunity of expressing our fellowship with them. If we take advantage of these opportunities our identification will gradually become more natural and more complete. But we must remember that we are joined up, not to be just part of an opposition but as a positive creative force desiring to make victims of a society into positive creators of a new and better world, and to transmit to them those Christian values which we have denied them in the past and without which no society can be stable.

The identification of St. Francis with the leper, of St. Lawrence with the poor, of Jesus with the publican and harlot, is the ministry of God's concern, a ministry which has in it the elements of penitence, sympathy, fellowship and

creative life. But if, in spite of all we can do, a violent clash comes, what is to be the position of the Christian ? I cannot tell. I cannot say what must be done in certain circumstances until I know the factors in the situation. It depends not only on the concrete external facts of the situation, but also on the temper of the people and of ourselves. Our attitude and our response to the facts now will, however, prepare us and them for the right response in any situation. If we respond to God's Will today, we will be capable of hearing and obeying His voice then. The situation will be different according to the measure of our response to the present call.

To say we will not be party to violence because it will be directed by people with anti-Christian values is to admit failure beforehand. To say violence is inevitable is to make it so. Even if it is true that all violence is wrong, I maintain that the way I have outlined is the only way to avoid it and we must therefore get on with our job. Personally, I cannot take the purely "non-violent", pacifist position. Most of us are prepared to accept the results of restraint and discipline in the community today and this restraint does not stop at violence when the privileges we enjoy are endangered. A Christian cannot refuse to accept some responsibility for this, nor can he refuse cooperation when new methods or organisation, involving other methods of restraint, become imperative.

THE EDITOR'S TRAVEL DIARY

Full Days in Paris

In that April week spent in Paris I was in the classical situation of the ass between the two haystacks. But instead of spending my time (as the classical ass would have done) mid-way between the Quartier Latin, where Karl Barth's meetings were held and the rue de Clichy where the Church and State Conference of the Stockholm Movement had convened, I tried to get the best of both worlds by squandering Federation money on the métro. For both were too good to be missed.

The lecture-room of Karl Barth was filled not only with the leading lights of the Sorbonne, and of Christian Paris (Catholic, Orthodox and Protestant) but also with an amazingly representative group of fédératifs from various corners of France. What Karl Barth gave was perhaps too condensed and too solid to be immediately digested and understood. It was therefore an excellent thing that the Paris S.C.M. had arranged a special meeting "for students only" where Barth spent all his time answering straightforward questions. Those who may have felt after listening to the lectures that Barth's message went over their heads, came to see another, less formidable and more human Barth, who knows how to enter into the real difficulties of a Christian student. Had they all been able to accompany the two Federation secretaries when they spent an afternoon with Barth inspecting old books on the quays of the Seine — they would have had an even stronger impression of the openness to life in all its manifold aspects of this theologian of the theologians.

And then there were the "Church and State" meetings, where theologians of many countries, among them such Federation friends as Marc Boegner, Dr. Oldham, H.-L. Henriod and Emil Brunner, were coming to grips with one of the most difficult problems of our time in which as a Federation we are vitally interested. It was encouraging to find that there was little of the vagueness about this symposium which has so often spoiled œcumenical meetings. "Stockholm" is launching out in a new and most hopeful direction. It is not too much to say that here we have one of the first signs of that decisively important development in Church relations for which many have been hoping and which consists in advancing from the stage of œcumenical politeness to the stage of hard and thorough œcumenical thinking.

The International Student Organisations meet in Geneva

Do Student World readers know that there are no less than six international student organisations officially recognised by the International Institute of Intellectual Cooperation and that their representatives meet regularly? This year's meeting was particularly important because it was to deal with "The Crisis in International Collaboration and its Effect on the International Student Organisations" and met at the League of Nations' Secretariat. Elsewhere in this number we give some extracts from the reports which were presented and which show that there is a great deal of re-thinking of the fundamentals of internationalism going on in all these movements. I was especially interested in the story of the recent developments in Pax Romana, the great Roman Catholic Student Movement, which in these last years has been able to obtain the adherence of the large majority of organised Roman Catholic students and with which our Federation entertains close and fruitful relations. It is curious to note how much the two Christian international student movements have in common in their present spiritual situation. Both are being driven back to a deeper Christian oecumenical conception of their international task in which the secular (political and cultural) internationalist ideas recede to the background. There ought to be more occasions, both nationally and internationally, where our two movements could interchange experiences and study the possibility of collaboration for ends which are of vital interest to both.

A month in Great Britain

I spent the whole of May in Great Britain to help the present leaders of the British Movement to put the case of the Federation and the national movement before the public of their country. It was necessary that this should be done, for the group of people who "were" the Federation and the S.C.M. to the public has been succeeded by a new generation which shares the fate of all new generations in that it comes upon the stage as a group of "dark horses" and which has consequently the duty to present itself.

The result was a tour of thirteen cities in the British Isles and a mixed salad of meetings in which Lord Mayors, Bishops or Vice-Chancellors took care of the setting while Robert Mackie, sometimes replaced by Oliver Tomkins, Francis House or Archie Hardie, and I had to "deliver the goods". There were excellent, indifferent and bad meetings among them, but the total impression left on me is that the British Movement is fortunate in being able to count on so much good will and true interest among the older generation.

Of the students I saw far less than I would have liked to see. My strongest impressions are those of inference rather than those of observation. It was for instance very significant to note that very often when I had spoken of the upheavals in student life and student thought all over the world, the reaction from chairman or public was: "Thank heaven that in this country things are different". I would be the last to ridicule that reaction — for it is precisely by comparing British university life with university life on the Continent of Europe or in Asia that one sees the immense value of its living, unbroken tradition as over against the hectic and nervous experimentation in other places. Great Britain is today more than ever an island, for it is almost alone among the great nations in that it is not at war with its own history.

As a result Christianity is more "at home" in Great Britain than almost anywhere else, except in small nations such as the Scandinavian countries. This is an exceptional blessing, not only for Great Britain but also for a world movement like our own, which needs more than ever the stability of support and the strong sense of Christian tradition which the British S.C.M. gives so generously to it. But there is another side. It is that only by the ploughing of deep furrows does one get a rich harvest. And British youth is not being "ploughed" to the same extent as youth in many other places. This seems to me the explanation for a certain lack of dynamic convictions among British students. There are encouraging developments such as the much more serious study of political problems, the widespread interest in pacifism and a questioning about religion — but the time of great inner revolution has not yet come. I believe that in these circumstances the S.C.M. is wise in increasingly emphasising the evangelistic part of its programme. For why should we wait until students are awakened by great events in the political realm? Why should we leave the initiative to some other revolution? Do we not believe that the message of the Gospel is quite as capable of stirring up a student generation as the social and political ideologies of the day?

True Oecumenism

Europe is small. On the 1st of June I spent the morning with the British staff at Annandale discussing the impressions of the last month and the evening with French S.C.M. leaders preparing the Oecumenical Retreat which was to begin on the next day.

I had only a glimpse of the Retreat itself but it was enough to be impressed with the solidity of approach to the problem of unity which our French colleagues are making with the help of the leaders of the Russian Movement and of younger Roman Catholic groups. The Orthodox were represented by Professor Fedotoff, a contributor to this

number of The Student World, by Professor Zankoff of Bulgaria, who brought most encouraging news of the Bulgarian Movement, and by many students. And the Roman Catholics brought as their main speaker the leader of one of the great Congregations of France. On the first day when I was present there was a most illuminating but somewhat too technical confrontation of theologies ; but I am told that on the next day a successful attempt was made to dig down to the more personal realm where it is easier, if not to find each other, at least to discover the true genius of the other's faith. So far there are but a few countries which have pioneered in this realm. When will others follow ?

And now for the Summer

The arrival of the summer is being announced in 13, rue Calvin not by one or two swallows but by twenty Indian women students under the leadership of Mrs. Datta who represent the advance-guard of the summer visitors. Before long they will be followed by the delegates to our Summer Conference at " la Châtaigneraie " which will be particularly well attended this year. Then comes the Executive Committee meeting and finally the North Eastern European Conference in Saldus (Latvia). Who said there was a crisis in international collaboration ?

THE STUDENT WORLD CHRONICLE

The Idol of Young India

To the western visitor who comes to India with his mind full of pictures of a great dramatic battle for national freedom, the first impressions of the present Indian scene are strangely disconcerting. Instead of the powerful and united national movement for which he looks, he finds innumerable groups engaged in quarrelsome discussions about problems of secondary importance. Instead of passionate and articulate convictions concerning the future of the country, he finds much uncertainty and even hopelessness.

But this is merely the first impression. This is the superficial, though not unreal aspect of Indian life; that part of it which is moulded by the systematic strategy of a powerful modern state-machinery which is willing to pay any price for the conservation of law and order. This is the India of today but not the India of the future.

For whenever one gets a chance to dig a little deeper, whenever one comes across men and women who are willing to break the ominous silence, based on fear and suspicion, one meets another India which thinks long, long thoughts and which looks beyond the days of communal strife, of discussions about Poona Pact and White Paper proposals to a time when India will emerge from its present impotence and become a nation in its own right. Who shall become the leader of this younger, forward-looking India? Who will give shape to its vague desires and provide it with an ideology as well as a strategy for the coming struggle?

Some time ago it would have seemed silly to ask that question. The answer was so obvious: there was one great national figure and one only, namely Mahatma Gandhi! But today the question is not so easily answered. In fact it is the most real question which can be asked about India today.

To be sure the Mahatma still occupies a very central place in India. He is still being looked upon very generally as the greatest living Indian and treated with the utmost reverence and respect. But the important point is that his real followers, those who do not merely say: "Mahatmaji", but who act as he would have them act,

constitute only a small band. The fact is that many of the most intelligent young Indians wonder whether Gandhi is not more a man of the past than of the future. They doubt whether he has a clear lead to give concerning the concrete task of the national movement in the near future. Less and less do the uprooted, largely irreligious Indian intellectuals understand the profoundly mystical and inherently traditional conceptions on which Gandhi's thought is based. The time is approaching when educated young India will find it almost as difficult to grasp the meaning of Gandhi's message as does the average modern Westerner.

But young India must have a leader, just as much as young Italy, young Russia or young Germany, just as much as any nation in process of formation or re-formation. It must be a man as modern as the thought-life with which the Indian intelligentsia is making itself familiar; as realistic as the atmosphere in which youth of 1934 grows up.

The one man in India who answers to this description is Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru and the title "Idol of young India", which has been attached to his name, is therefore no mere Eastern rhetoric but full of significance. It is not that the Pandit goes out of his way to win a personal allegiance. On the contrary. I wonder if there is any other "idol" of youth who has so little of the demagogue about him. When I met him first in his house where our talk was constantly interrupted by the shouts of groups of students or boy-scouts: "Pandit Jawaharlal-ji-kai" and later at a Student Conference when he was forced to give a message to students, I found him using these occasions not for his personal aggrandisement but for the glorification of a great impersonal cause.

His popularity must then have a more enduring basis than mere attachment to an interesting personality. It must be that he formulates what lives unconsciously in the minds of many. Though born of a family of Kashmiri Brahmins, Nehru is altogether a man of the twentieth century, a man who knows as much about the "acids of modernity" as Walter Lippmann himself, a man thoroughly emancipated from the traditions of his own land and thoroughly converted to that supra-national faith which is secular rationalism. He writes: "Our politics must either be those of magic or of science. The former, of course, requires no argument or logic; the latter is in theory at least entirely based on clarity of thought and reasoning and has no room for vague idealistic or religious or sentimental processes which confuse and befog the mind. Personally I have no faith in or use for the ways of magic and religion and I can only consider the question on scientific grounds".

On the basis of these presuppositions Pandit Jawaharlal considers that the Marxist conception of history is the only adequate explanation of world events and holds that "gradually the nationalist struggle for freedom is becoming a social struggle also for economic freedom. Independence and the socialist state become the objectives, with varying degrees of stress being laid on the two aspects of the problem". He is specially interested in the Russian experiment of which he has made a close study and believes that it has a tremendous lesson to teach to India, particularly through its solution of the agricultural problem. In fact there is according to him no other way out of the terrible impasse of the Indian farming situation than the collectivisation of all agriculture.

But how shall this goal be reached? Nehru has little to say about the immediate problems of the present hour for the scramble for seats in electorates and indeed the whole struggle over the White Paper proposals seems to him a shadow-fight. For the moment the non-violent policy is the best one, not because of moral or religious reasons but simply because there is no other possibility where one is confronted with a strongly armed government. In the meantime the organisation of the farmers must be taken in hand in order to prepare them for the decisive battle which will lead to both political and social emancipation.

If one hears Pandit Jawaharlal exposing these convictions it is difficult to realise that one has to do with the Secretary General of the same movement of which Mahatma Gandhi is the recognised leader. Not a word about the great concepts which we Westerners have learned to associate with the Indian national movement. Instead of Gandhi's constant reference to the age-old tenets of Hinduism an astounding familiarity with doctrines of mass-action and economic revolution! Instead of the never completely understood and often unexpected aphorisms of an old-world sage the matter-of-fact, clearest statements of a twentieth-century politician!

The question arises whether these two — Gandhi and Nehru — will be able to continue their close collaboration of the past or whether the growing divergence of their ideas will force them to part company. For the moment they remain loyal to each other in view of the critical situation of the cause which they both love. And they go out of their way to defend each other. "Gandhi", said Nehru to me, "believes in the policy of one step enough for me. He has not yet chosen as to future social policy". A few days later the papers reported that Gandhi had said: "Nehru's own views have not sufficiently crystallised to make any fundamental departure from Congress policy likely". But ideas have an inherent force of their own and

the gulf between Gandhi, ascetic teacher of old Hindu wisdom and Nehru, product of Harrow and Cambridge and steeped in Marx and Lenin, is bound to grow. Even today, while officially no one needs to choose for the one or against the other, young Indians who want to build up a political philosophy of their own, are discovering that they are faced with an either — or : In its sharpest form this is felt in the ranks of the " Youth Movement " which looks to Nehru for leadership and which is consciously anti-Gandhi for three significant reasons : 1) because Gandhi is religious, while they are anti-religious ; 2) because Gandhi does not believe in class-war while they are Marxists ; 3) because Gandhi is a pacifist, while they believe in the use of violence to further economic and national freedom. It would seem that before long the choice will have to be made by all young Indians. Will they follow the call of Mother India, that is the call of their own tradition, which speaks through Gandhi ? Or will they follow the call of the communist paradise, which speaks through Nehru ? The struggle in their souls will be terrific for in either case will they have to choose against part of themselves : against the voice of their blood or against their fighting instincts and their desire for an early transformation of the whole economic system.

For some time to come this tragic conflict in the soul of young India will yet be obscured by the fact of common opposition to the foreign power which governs India. But a day will come when India will have to face the alternative and accept the consequences of its choice.

W. A. VISSER 'T HOOFT

The Position of Protestant Christianity in Japan and China

I sometimes wonder whether any two people in the world are more unlike than the Japanese and the Chinese in spite of their traditional ties of culture. At any rate the position of Christianity in the two countries is very different. There is some justification, however, for attempting to deal with both countries in one paper since their destiny is so closely inter-twined that one cannot think of the future of the Church in the Far East without thinking of it in relation to that common destiny. If the Church is something more than a Japanese institution or a Chinese institution, how does it function in relation to the total social situation of which the Japanese

and Chinese people are both an integral part ? That is the crucial question for Christian strategy in the Far East. But that question cannot be answered apart from a realistic attempt to understand the actual situation in which both Japanese and Chinese Christians find themselves.

There are, to be sure, a certain number of characteristics common to the Christian community in both countries. Some of these common characteristics are :

1. The "thought-forms" in which Christianity is expressed are almost universally the "thought-forms" of the Christian community in America and Western Europe. No process of cross-fertilisation or assimilation has taken place comparable to the process that occurred during the first three centuries between Christian thought and Greek thought.
2. Christian groups in the cities of both countries are for the most part recruited from the capitalist middle classes and tend to be specifically identified with the point of view of those classes.
3. The Christian Churches in both countries are essentially national institutions and hence are peculiarly susceptible to the pressure of militant nationalism.
4. The Christian students of both countries tend to be more self-satisfied than the non-Christian students.

Apart from such general similarities, however, the actual situations in which Christians find themselves in the two countries are so different that it is preferable to describe them separately. Perhaps the simplest way of putting this dissimilarity is to say that China's intellectual and spiritual orientation is very definitely towards the United States and Great Britain while Japan's intellectual and spiritual orientation is very definitely towards the Continent of Europe and particularly towards Germany. Barth's books were best sellers in Japan before they had even been heard of in China.

The Situation in China

For most educated Chinese Christianity is still thought of as essentially the spiritual aspect of western civilisation. It is consequently associated with the dynamic achievements of that civilisation, and is thought to have supplied the moral fibre and tonic which made those achievements possible. Christian apologists from the West have for the most part encouraged this concept. They have

frequently spoken of Christianity as the "way out" for China. The result has been that even among some of the most spiritually minded Chinese Christian leaders the Christian faith is thought of primarily in terms of utility. The question in their minds is not, is it true? but is it useful to the Chinese people?

I wish to underline this point because Protestant Christianity's capacity to survive in the Far East will, I think, depend very largely upon its answer to the question, "Is Christianity the way out?" In the mind of the Chinese intellectual "the way out" means very definitely the recovery of the four eastern provinces and driving the Japanese off the Asiatic mainland. He sees that his being a Christian makes, for the moment at any rate, very little difference in relation to China's success in the Sino-Japanese conflict. The so-called Christian nations of the West do not intervene to stop Japan or save China as he expected they would, and the League of Nations (which is associated in his mind with Christian idealism in the West) has proved to be both impotent and futile. The inevitable conclusion which surges up in his mind is that Christianity must also be impotent and hence futile. Some of those whom we have come to regard as the finest examples of Chinese Christianity are passing through a period of profound spiritual crisis in their own lives because Christianity seems to have failed them and failed China during the past two years.

Astonishing as it may seem, few of these men ever seem to be haunted by the question: "Is it possible that God's way out for China may be something very different from the way out which we desire?" This failure to distinguish between our way out and God's way out seems to me to be a fatal weakness in Chinese Christian thought, and it is a weakness for which we American Christians are partly responsible. The pre-world-war tendency to identify the Christian Movement in the West with the progress of civilisation and even with the strength of western nations, has left a far deeper imprint on the thinking of the Christian community in the Orient than we usually realise. "By their fruits ye shall know them", has been interpreted in a very literal sense, and it is the natural man's idea of "fruit" rather than the New Testament idea of "fruit" which is taken as the standard of measurement.

I have been speaking of men who are the recognised leaders of the Chinese Christian community. Among the rank and file of Christian students the idea of Christianity is usually far more naïvely and crudely utilitarian. The Christian faith attracts because it is conceived of as a social panacea. A corollary of this is that one often comes across an anti-theological obsession which amounts almost to a mania,

and which closely resembles the similar obsession among groups of liberal Christian students in Anglo-Saxon countries.

In such an atmosphere it is obviously very difficult to present the basic assumptions of the Christian faith in such a way that they can be understood. The idea of the Suffering Servant and even more of the Suffering Nation purified by its captivity is not a part of Chinese Christian thought. The suggestion that God's Will for China might be through the valley of defeat and humiliation is a scandal for the acceptance of which the teaching of their intellectual leaders has not prepared the Christian Community and which seems utterly contrary to what they had been led to believe Christianity would do for them.

On the other hand there is probably no country in the world where the university population is as accessible to the Christian message as the university population of China. The mood of the government school non-Christian student community, particularly in North and Central China, has undergone a profound transformation during the past year. The inability of the League of Nations to influence the course of events in Manchuria, the ease with which the Japanese armies overran Jehol, the financial control secured by Japan over the Chinese politicians of the Peiping area, the trend towards a pro-Japanese orientation on the part of the Nanking Government — this accumulation of disasters and humiliations has not only completely deflated the confident egoism of the Chinese student, but has also produced profound disillusionment and a genuine hunger for spiritual reality. It was the first time in my life that I had ever faced audiences for whom the tragic sense of life had produced such hunger, and it was a terrifying experience. Their faces hurled at one the question, "What can you say about Truth that will make any difference for us?"

All traces of the so-called anti-Christian Student Movement which had flourished since 1922, and which was still in evidence in July 1932, have completely disappeared. If there ever was a field ripe for the harvest, it is these government students of North China.

This hunger for religious reality expresses itself among the less educated in the emotional fervour of the Bethel Movement which is spreading like a wild fire in some sections of the country.

As far as the students are concerned there are two great religions contesting for their souls — the religion of communism and the religion of the New Testament. It seems to me utterly unreal to speak of Buddhism or of any other religious current traditional to Chinese life in the same breath with these two.

My experiences in the Far East these past two years have convinced me that the study of comparative religions as usually conducted in western universities gives the student a completely erroneous impression of the actualities of the contemporary religious scene. The vital living alternatives to the Christian Faith are not those indicated. Karl Marx or Lenin and not Buddha or Confucius are the alternatives to Jesus Christ in the mind of the young Chinese intellectual.

If one were dealing with world-wide contemporary religious movements there would be only three great movements to compare : Communism, Nationalism and Christianity. All the rest are of quite secondary importance in comparison with these. I have not mentioned nationalism in China because what is usually described as Chinese nationalism seems to me to be something very different from the nationalism, say of Germany or Japan. It is really not nationalism at all in a positive sense, but rather a negative emotion, a bitter hatred of the Japanese. If that negative emotion can be maintained long enough it will, no doubt, serve in time as one of the principal stimuli in producing a positive sense of *China* as a self-conscious human collectivity with a destiny to fulfil, and then real nationalism will appear. And that will be a very different thing for the Japanese to reckon with.

In such a situation the task of Christian leaders seems to me to be very clearly defined. As I understand it, it is :

1. To engage in Christian thought about the meaning of their faith,
2. To witness to whatever Truth God may have given them.
3. To relate this Truth to the actual social situation in China. (This is in essence the problem of what the Christian ethic has to say about the life of the Chinese village. Communism has a very clear-cut solution for this problem. What is the Christian solution ?)
4. To work towards the creation of a Church which in its own corporate life witnesses to the Christian Faith and Ethic, and which elicits from its members a social loyalty, comparable to the loyalty demanded of its members by the Communist Party.

The Situation in Japan

The character of my visits to Japan, both in 1932 and 1933, hardly warrant a considered opinion about the position of Japanese Christian-

ity. Both visits were very brief and I moved in rather limited circles. Consequently my impressions, though vivid enough in themselves, probably represent only a part of the picture.

One particularly strong impression was that the Japanese people are in some ways the most religious people in the world. Not only are the three great world religions (Christianity, Communism and Nationalism) contending for their soul, but all of the lesser religions appear to be thriving. Temples were usually in good repair, new shrines were being erected, there seemed to be a fairly steady stream of local worshippers and thousands of pilgrims were on their way.

Buddhism is very much more alive in Japan than in China, but in spite of its external appearance of vitality and in spite of its commanding numerical superiority in such cities as Kyoto, I do not believe it will have an important historic rôle to play in moulding the future of Japan. It is too other-worldly and Japan, for some time to come, will be very much involved in this world.

Shintoism on the other hand is exactly suited to the present mood of the Japanese people. It seems to be the really authentic indigenous expression of Japanese religious life. It was a Shinto temple that was dedicated this autumn across from the fortress-barracks on North Szechwan Road, Shanghai, to contain the ashes of the "glorious dead" of the Shanghai incident and new Shinto shrines are springing up in all parts of the country to serve as repositories for the ashes of the slain Manchurian heroes and as centres of patriotic religious pilgrimages. The new interest in the veneration of the shrines that has been sweeping the country this year is one of the most ominous developments in contemporary Japanese life. It means that the cult of the National Being is not only a dynamic living movement, but that for the time being it has become the dominant religion of Japan.

It is an interesting fact that among the intellectuals communism has a greater appeal than nationalism. The arrest of some 13,000 university men and women (students and professors) during the past four years on the charge of communistic activity is evidence of the power of its appeal.

When one turns to the Christian movement in such a situation, his first impression is an impression of its relative insignificance. In the presence of its great rivals representing the most dynamic revolutionary social forces which exist, it appears to be overwhelmed even before the conflict has really begun. And a cursory examination of the position of the Japanese Protestant Churches does little to reassure one. The Metropolitan Churches are if anything even more closely identified with the capitalist middle classes in Japan than in

China. As a result they are almost completely inhibited from dealing adequately with the challenge of communism. Further, the Japanese Protestant denominations are essentially national institutions. The result is that in times of international tension the members of the Christian community do not think of their membership in the Church as implying a social loyalty which conditions loyalty to the state. In years to come the question of God or Cæsar will probably constitute the supreme test of the faithfulness of Japanese Christians, and they are as yet quite unprepared to meet that test.

There is a further weakness inherent in Japanese Christianity which is derived in part from the curiosity and aptness for imitation characteristic of the Japanese race. It is that so many of the ideas of their Christian leaders are rather poorly assimilated importations from the West and particularly from Northern Europe. Not only do important German theological works appear in Japanese translations almost at the same time that they come from the German presses, but the most recent opinions of Brunner or Barth or Tillich are discussed with an avidity and loquaciousness, hardly equalled in Europe itself.

But in spite of all of these weaknesses, I am fundamentally optimistic about the future of the Japanese Church. Several younger Christian thinkers in Japan are very deeply concerned about the necessity of clarifying the intellectual content of Christianity. This determination to think through the meaning of their faith rests on the assumption that no religion can permanently endure which is not seen with the eye of reason as well as with the eye of faith and seen by both reason and faith to be related to Eternal Reality.

The Japanese are naturally disposed to theology and since the Japanese Empire will probably dominate the political life of Asia for years to come, it seems likely that Japanese thinkers will play an important part in helping to determine the thought-forms of the Church in the Orient. The supreme need of the Japanese Christian community is to acquire a sense of the Church Universal that over-arches and conditions the destiny of the Empire. The value of the contribution of Japanese Christians to the rest of the Orient will largely depend upon whether or not they acquire this sense.

In spite of the differences between the Christian communities in Japan and China, as I have tried to think about their future, I believe that the Christians of both these countries are facing the same great issues, though the manner of their thought about these issues and their method of dealing with them will naturally vary considerably. If the Protestant Christian movement is to survive in the Far East

I am convinced that it will have to deal far more adequately than it has in the past with three great issues :

(1) *The issue of the Christian doctrine*; (2) *The issue of the Church*; (3) *The issue of the Christian Community and the Social Order*.

1. By dealing with Christian doctrine I mean creating a system of theology which interprets the essential truths of the Christian faith in categories of thought which are both comprehensible to the Chinese or Japanese mind and also equal to defence and offence in relation to communism and nationalism. The Church in the East needs dogma — not the militant dogma born out of the actualities of the Far Eastern tragedy, and at the same time organically related to the great streams of historic Christian thought. The power of the communists consists in the fact that they have a living doctrine — that is a system of ideas which they believe springs necessarily out of the historic moment in which they live but is at the same time rooted in eternal reality. For the communists' truth is "given" by the objective nature of the process of history. Men who believe that they possess that kind of truth, and who also see themselves as the chosen instruments for its historic actualisation in a given period of time, such men can turn the world upside down. Such a man was St. Paul and such a man was Lenin. In this fatal hour of human history and of the history of the Christian Church, it is the shame of many sections of the Protestant Church that we tend to remain anti-intellectual, that we deride doctrine, pour contempt on dogma and advocate in its place a sentimental glow of good feeling which may or may not be Christian and which in either case is doomed to be blown away by the first full gale that comes upon it from a movement that is both dogmatic and passionate — passionate because its dogma is a living thing felt to spring from reality.

Because our doctrine is so often bad doctrine we decry theology. There is just as much sense in decrying psychology because there are so many pseudo-psychiatrists. Our task is not to deplore dogma but to make dogma, dogma that is both true and adequate for the religious and social needs of our day.

2. By dealing with the Church, I mean creating what for us Protestants is a relatively new concept of the Church, a concept of a corporate community rather than of a society of individuals, of a community that is universal and catholic rather than of a community that is national or sectarian. A good Protestant would say, "Why, I already believe in that kind of Church — that is the Church Invisible, isn't it?" Well, is there anything in the Christian Faith

which requires us to keep it *invisible*? Is not the supreme task of our generation just that of making the invisible Church more visible? I sometimes think that laymen are seeing this much more clearly than those of us who are ministers or theological professors. For instance, the address given by Henry A. Wallace, Secretary of Agriculture, before the Federal Council of Churches in Washington on December 7th last is miles ahead of the thinking of most Protestant theologians or ministers. In the course of that address Mr. Wallace said: "I am wondering if the religion we shall need during the next hundred years will not have much more in common with the Christianity of the second and third centuries or possibly even with that of the Middle Ages than with the Protestantism of the past one hundred years. The strong personal initiative conferred by the Protestant religions must in some way be merged into a powerful religious attitude concerning the entire social structure.... Neither socialism nor communism meets the realities of human nature as I sense them. Both of them have an emotional dryness, a dogmatic thinness which repels me. They deal in the dry bones of the 'economic man' and I crave in addition the flesh and blood and spirit of the religious and the artistic man".

3. By dealing with the Christian Community and the Social Order I mean three things:

(a) Making the Christian Community itself a more adequate demonstration of what is meant by a Christian Social Order; (b) encouraging lay groups to work at such questions as: "In the particular concrete situation in which we find ourselves what kind of social order would the Christian ethic compel us to try to build?" The only effective answer to communism in China is "Go thou, and do likewise"; (c) preparing Christian laymen to enter public life in order to work at this problem directly and in a responsible way rather than remaining content with talk and irresponsibility.

It will be obvious from what has been said that as a result of this second trip to the Far East, I am convinced that the first five chapters of the *Laymen's Report* is rather misleading in its analysis of the position of the Christian Movement in Japan and China. The work of that commission seems to me to be a real tragedy. It is a tragedy not so much because it raised false issues as because it failed to raise the most important issues. Any document prepared at the time it was prepared which:

(1) Pleads for less emphasis on doctrine (as if there were no doctrine except the doctrine of the Fundamentalists) and by so doing

belittles the function of reason in determining the meaning and task of Christianity ;

(2) Says about nationalism in the Far East : " The newer nationalism is inclusive, not exclusive ; it has learned to take what is universal, not as western, but as its own — hence the oriental states are, or are becoming, self-directing members of the World Community ". (I presume that the most charitable comment that could be made on such a statement is that it is " wishful thinking. ") ;

(3) Contains no clear concept of the Church Universal to offset the paralysing effects of religious nationalism ;

(4) Ignores communism and its challenge to Christianity ; any such document is so completely unrelated to contemporary actuality in the Far East that one wonders how its editors could have succeeded as well as they did in immunising themselves against the meaning of their environment. Is it possible that throughout their tour they lived exclusively within the protected social " milieu " of traditional religious groups, and were never exposed to the shock of the volcanic social forces that are shaping the destiny of the East ? Doubtless their work would have been much more reliable if the Commission had included one or two hard-boiled newspapermen who could have told the other members what was going on around them.

If the Churches in the Far East became the kind of Churches this report envisages, it is certain that the Second Laymen's Inquiry (which presumably would be made at the end of the second century of Protestant missionary activity) would scarcely find a trace of the Protestant movement left. A Christian Church so conceived simply would not have the social and intellectual fibre necessary to survive in the kind of society that is coming in the Orient.

Can the Protestant Churches in the West demonstrate that they are capable of providing a more inspiring and competent leadership than that represented by the Laymen's Commission ? I believe that they can. The following tasks illustrate the type of collaboration from the western Churches required by the Church of Christ in the Orient :

1. A group to visit China and Japan not primarily for the purpose of securing facts or of interpreting them, but to meet groups of Church leaders (missionaries and nationals) in a series of carefully planned week-end retreats to work with them on :

(a) The content of the Christian message, (b) the function and task of the Christian Church.

Such a visit would be in the nature of a mission of fellowship. It would be a demonstration not of the "power to investigate" but of the ability to enter into and sympathetically participate in the process of building up a Church in Asia that is conscious of its mission to Asia.

2. An adequate training-centre in China for Church workers. The future of Union Theological College at Nanking is one of the most critical Church questions in China.

3. Every two or three years a Council of the whole Church in Asia to encourage inter-Church action and create a vivid consciousness of participation in the life of the Church Universal.

Francis P. MILLER

The International Student Organisations in the Crisis of International Cooperation

The main theme of discussion at the meeting of representatives of International Student Organisations, held at the Secretariat of the League of Nations on April 16th and 17th, was, "the effect of the crisis of international collaboration on the international student organisations". The following organisations were represented: Pax Romana, the International Federation of University Women, the Student Federation for the League of Nations, the International Confederation of Students, the International Student Service, the World Union of Jewish Students and the World's Student Christian Federation.

The general impression was that the student organisations are remarkably successful in holding their own with regard to the volume and quality of their international activities, but that they are practically all in the midst of a process of rethinking their philosophy and raison d'être. The reasons why this reconsideration of fundamental convictions has become inevitable are well stated in the following extracts from a report presented by Dr. Werner Picht:

Of the seven organisations which belong to this committee, six have been founded in the years immediately following the great war¹. This means that however different may have been the reasons which have led to the founding of these international student movements, they have at least this in common that they owe their existence

¹ The World's Student Christian Federation is the only international student organisation founded before the war.

to the strong wave of pacifism which dominated international life in the years immediately following the war and which led to the formation of the League of Nations. For this same reason these organisations have suffered a great deal from the sudden breakdown of the pacifist idea and the extent of their difficulties depends on the extent to which they have identified themselves with the post-war ideology and to which they have been making use of the special methods based on these ideologies.

The period which has seen the rise of the great international projects and which has led to such a remarkable increase of international collaboration among students, must now be considered as coming to a close. In fact, its end has come with a suddenness and a definiteness such as one finds rarely in the evolution of historical movements. During this period the attempt was made all over the world to give humanity, after the experience of the world war, a new consciousness of its solidarity and to organise the world accordingly. It was thought that it would be possible thus to avoid the recurrence to armed conflict or at least to avoid the "second world war". Mankind had a great vision of a world in which the spectre of war would have been overcome for the first time in human history and which would arrive at a new stage of evolution in which a family of nations would live in peace. This aim, it was hoped, would be fulfilled by the development of mutual understanding among the nations. Through the suppression of ignorance and misunderstanding and through anti-war propaganda, based on the experiences of the last war, the policy to settle difficulties by war-like methods would be eradicated. As democracy seemed to gain ground every day, it was expected that every government would soon be forced to adopt more peaceful political methods.

This faith is dead today. Just as at the beginning of our century a well-known politician endeavoured to show the "great illusion" involved in the idea of the war profits, in the same way the history of the last few years has destroyed the optimistic belief in a progress which through organisation and intellectual enlightenment would create a state of peace, of prosperity, of happiness in the whole wide world. The expectation of a triumphant forward-march of the democratic idea has not been realised. New democratic experiences have led to disillusionment and even older democracies are today passing through a crisis of the democratic conceptions. The attempts to create an atmosphere of international understanding, especially those among the intelligentsia, have proved powerless in the political domain and the psychological results have remained far below expectations, not only in so far as the masses are concerned but even among

the so-called leading classes. There are many who expect further armed conflict and take a fatalistic attitude to this eventuality. The ideal of "Europe" stands today only for a fiction and the picture of one humanity, united by its common interests, is overshadowed by the rivalry of the nations.

The international student organisations are very specially influenced by this crisis, for the ideology of internationalism gave them a very important and decisive task. They were ready to accept this task and to accept the ideology on which it was based. Whether we take the World's Student Christian Federation, which presented its aim as being the interpenetration of the Christian and the international spirit, whether it is the International Federation of University Women, which desires to develop mutual understanding and friendly relations between the women students of all countries so as to increase sympathy and the spirit of mutual service among the peoples, whether it is the International Confederation of Students, which declares, "We believe that one of the strongest means which humanity has at its disposal to establish peace is to get the intellectuals of all countries to know and appreciate each other from their youth onwards", whether it is the International Student Service which puts its faith in *humanitas* at the head of its programme and which believes to have shown a new road leading towards the world which humanity is looking for, everywhere there is a dependence on the same ideology, even in cases where this ideology is combined with a religious orientation. And in all these cases there is therefore the danger of becoming a victim to the same "great illusion". In other words the fundamental change in the world situation raises for all student organisations the problem of their *raison d'être*. They have to face the fact that, even if the crisis does not yet immediately endanger their life, their very existence is at stake....

But on what rock could international collaboration be founded since the internationalism which has been its common denominator in the past seems to be breaking down ?...

The reason for the present ideological crisis in international collaboration among students is that this collaboration was not based on an ideology of its own but that it was simply the echo of the general ideologies of the time. Some day historians will consider it a mistake of post-war youth that it has not followed its own destiny. The annals of international student organisations offer many examples which show that far too often has post-war youth adopted the methods and the ideas of the older generation and looked for their approval and support. In doing so students forgot their own specific task which is within the university world or at any rate they did not

emphasise this aspect sufficiently. It would seem, however, that it is on the basis of this common sharing in university life alone that a sense of solidarity between students of different nations who are not held together by common ideas or common race can be maintained....

The future of international collaboration depends, therefore, on the possibility of liberating it from the ideologies which have bound it to a particular internationalism which has too often been considered naïvely as its only possible basis. What may bind students and what should be vigorously propagated among them is the general feeling of belonging to the *civitas academica* which is supra-national rather than international....

The influence of mutual understanding among the nations and especially among the intellectuals of different nations on the maintenance of world peace has often been exaggerated. Politics do not simply depend on the understanding of a nation by its neighbours but rather on the ability of states to agree on the practical conditions of their common existence. And the first does not necessarily lead to the second. It is fortunate that this is so, for to transcend frontiers psychologically, to understand the genius of another nation is so much more difficult than optimistic rationalism is willing to admit ; moreover it presupposes such an effort of mind, of character and of experience, that it can never be accomplished by more than a very few. But for these very reasons this task is the special mission of the élite university youth. If by accepting this task they may not accomplish much for the maintenance of peace, even indirectly, they will at least have helped toward the circulation of intellectual life without which even national intellectual life soon becomes barren. The tension which follows from the simultaneous partnership in a national and international community is an essential factor in the development of those qualities which should characterise intellectual leaders .

The religious movements are less seriously affected by the crisis of internationalism because their main dynamic is outside the realm of social or political motives. But they have, nevertheless, to face the problem of the relation between Christianity and internationalism in a new way. Thus Pax Romana, the international Roman Catholic Student Federation, which unites practically all Roman Catholic Student Movements in Europe as well as in America, reports:

It is very difficult to judge to [what extent the international spirit in the activity of our national movements is growing or de-

creasing. There can be no doubt, however, that our students are very deeply concerned with national issues and that the interest in international problems has considerably diminished. We note this latter tendency especially in the programmes of conferences and meetings. In addition to religious and cultural questions which take first place in the activities of our movement, our members are specially concerned with such issues as the corporate state, the nature of the state, social reform, etc. Their underlying conviction seems to be the following: "We should first establish order in the smaller communities, such as family, nation and state, before we go on to discuss the international order". As leaders we make the attempt to educate our members in an understanding of the close relations between these two realms and to get them interested, to some extent at least, in international issues.

With regard to the constitution of Pax Romana and the conditions of membership no change seems to be called for, for Pax Romana is and will always remain the service centre for the national movements of Catholic students. It is our task to help these movements in the realm of their Catholic action in the universities by means of international exchange of experience and ideas. This general task is to a very large extent independent from the momentary circumstances in the national or international realm; the more so since we exclude from our work and especially from our international work all purely political activity.

On the other hand we have been gradually led to give a somewhat different orientation to all our activities by emphasising our work for the Catholic University Movement of the individual countries rather than the activities for better relations between the different nations. Our movements have unanimously agreed to this difference in emphasis, although they have insisted that we should not give up altogether our direct work for international understanding.

We are convinced that this new orientation of our activity is quite adequate to assure a happy future for our organisation. We believe that we must bring Catholic students to see that work for the international committee is the logical outcome of their activity in the national realm and that in the religious convictions of all Catholics there is implied the call to continuous activity for the establishment of order, not only in the family and in the state, but also in international relations. Our work tends, therefore, to emphasise the religious and spiritual interests of our members while counter-acting as much as possible the suspicion with which students look upon international work.

The report of our World's Student Christian Federation strikes a very similar note:

The crisis in international relations has had a stimulating rather than a depressing effect on the spirit and activities of our Movement. We have not lost one single National Movement but added two Movements to the list of "corresponding members". Again we may report that in spite of financial difficulties and international tension the contacts between the National Movements as well as those between individual Movements and the Federation as a whole have been more frequent than in earlier periods. In fact it would seem that the very crisis of international political relations has in many cases been felt as a challenge to greater activity in the international realm. For we find that in those sections of the world where misunderstanding and ill feeling are felt most acutely, National Movements are particularly active in their international work. A typical example is the action taken by one of our Executive student members from America who arranged for a group of Chinese students to visit Japanese universities with the result that in both countries Christian students begin to investigate possibilities of reconciliation and better understanding. Again in these last years the Franco-German relations within our Federation have been exceedingly cordial. At the South Eastern European Leaders Conference, Czechs, Hungarians and Austrians meet annually. The British Movement sent a special student representative to the Indian Student Christian Movement Quadrennial at Allahabad in view of the strained relations between India and Britain. A similar trend is noticeable in interracial relations. In the Southern States of the U.S.A. interracial conferences under the auspices of the American S.C.M. have recently grown considerably in number and in size.

From the above it follows that we are not called upon to make fundamental changes in our policy. It must, however, be added that it is due to the increasingly critical attitude of students towards internationalism as such that we have been forced to reconsider the very basis of our attitude to international relations. In the first period after the war when the world atmosphere was congenial to internationalism, we have often presented our aim as being the interpenetration of the Christian and the international spirit. In these last years, however, we have begun to see that our task is quite different. The crisis of the international spirit has made us wonder whether the future of our work should depend on the ups and downs of the international spirit. As a result we have come to see that our main job is of an *oecumenical* rather than an *international* nature. By this we mean that it is a natural outcome of our Christian con-

viction that, as Christian students of different nationalities and races, we want to have fellowship with each other. In other words, the international character of our movement is now seen as a by-product of our whole attitude to life. Whether the general atmosphere is favourable to international relations or not, our Christian fellowship should remain intact, because it is founded on abiding religious convictions, irrespective of the political international constellation.

This feeling is well expressed in a statement made by one of our British leaders at a recent session of the Council of European Student Christian Movements. He says: The breakdown of optimistic idealism regarding the League of Nations has led to wide discussions on peace and war. This is not an abstract discussion, because many students *expect* war. There is a feeling in our Movement that the centre of our faith must now be the Church as a supra-national reality to which our first loyalty is due and which we must try to realise immediately.

But if our attitude to international relations is increasingly concerned with the supra-national community of Christians, we recognise nevertheless that we have a task in the field of general politics. For this reason our Federation has taken a keen interest in the question of Disarmament. This interest was especially strong during the first year of the Disarmament Conference. Unfortunately the slow death of this conference has made it very hard to keep up any interest whatsoever. In the meantime the question of personal participation in war has become much more acute. To this question very different answers are given, ranging from conscientious objection under all circumstances to unqualified readiness to support one's national government.

BOOK REVIEWS

Jeunesses Révolutionnaires en France

LA RÉVOLUTION NÉCESSAIRE, R. Aron et Dandieu. *Paris, Grasset.*

ÉLÉMENTS DE NOTRE DESTIN, Daniel-Rops. *Paris, Spes.*

DEMAIN, LA FRANCE, Robert Francis, Thierry Maunier, J.P. Maxence.
Paris, Grasset.

NÉO-SOCIALISME (Ordre, Autorité, Nation), B. Montagnon, A. Marquet, M. Déat. *Paris, Grasset.*

POUR LE BIEN COMMUN, Manifeste signé par cinquante écrivains et professeurs catholiques. *Paris, Desclée de Brouwer.*

Les Revues : ESPRIT, ORDRE NOUVEAU, LA LUTTE, etc.

On se souvient que durant plusieurs années, et à une cadence de plus en plus fréquente, parurent en Allemagne avant la prise du pouvoir par le national-socialisme, des ouvrages qui prétendaient exprimer la volonté révolutionnaire du peuple et notamment de la jeunesse. Le *Student World* en a signalé plusieurs, notamment celui de Günther Gründel. Cette préparation intellectuelle allant de pair avec l'activité, régulière ou violente, du parti national-socialiste, a été une des caractéristiques de la révolution allemande.

Assistons-nous à un mouvement de ce genre en France et peut-on prévoir qu'il aura les mêmes conséquences de renversement politique ? Il est difficile de faire aucun pronostic quant à la deuxième question, les conditions économiques, les traditions historiques et le tempérament national différant considérablement dans ces deux pays. Ce qui est certain, c'est que foisonnent actuellement en France les livres, tracts, programmes de rénovation économique et politique en même temps que se créent presque chaque semaine de nouveaux groupements pour la plupart composés et dirigés par des jeunes dont l'intention avouée est de renverser l'ordre existant et d'ouvrir la voie à de nouveaux régimes aussi bien de gouvernement que d'économie. Dans la diversité de ces formations et de ces manifestes il est parfois difficile à l'observateur étranger de s'orienter, tant les distinctions idéologiques et pratiques sont liées à des circonstances ou à des hommes. Le fait évident c'est que, pour le moment, si une nette volonté révolutionnaire s'affirme en France, elle ne se concrétise pas, comme en Allemagne et en Italie, autour d'un homme ou d'un grand parti. Nous n'avons pas de Hitler, ni de Mussolini, peut-être parce que nous ne sommes pas disposés à en reconnaître un comme le chef qu'on ne discute pas.

Pour résumer à grands traits ces protestations variées contre l'ordre existant et ces ambitions créatrices disons :

1° que sur le terrain politique proprement dit, qui les intéresse d'ailleurs très inégalement, la plupart de ces mouvements sont unanimes à déclarer périmé le parlementarisme dont l'impuissance à gouverner, le manque d'aptitude à se renouveler, la terrible dépendance des puissances financières sont évidentes même à l'observateur le plus favorable. — D'où nécessité d'instaurer un régime où l'idée d'autorité soit remise en honneur et la représentation professionnelle substituée à un régime électoral fondé sur un individualisme abstrait.

2° Dans le domaine économique et social, unanimité aussi contre l'ordre capitaliste — ce désordre établi — vestige du libéralisme. Inefficace économiquement puisqu'il se heurte à l'insurmontable phénomène du chômage d'une part et que de l'autre toutes ses grandes entreprises, bancaires et industrielles, sont contraintes de faire appel au concours de l'Etat pour subsister, le capitalisme est condamné bien davantage du point de vue moral. Il est foncièrement inhumain puisqu'il réduit l'homme à être la pièce interchangeable d'un mécanisme aveugle ; il en fait l'élément anonyme du prix de revient et supprime ainsi peu à peu chez l'immense majorité des salariés la faculté créatrice et la joie du travail. — Sur le nouveau régime économique qui devra prendre la place du capitalisme l'unanimité cesse : les uns proposent un capitalisme d'Etat, d'autres une économie dirigée, d'autres un système mixte de communisme minimum laissant subsister dans certaines limites la propriété privée ; les marxistes naturellement revendiquent une socialisation complète du crédit et des moyens de production.

3° Sur le terrain moral, humain pourrait-on dire, tous ces mouvements entendent défendre les droits de la personne contre la sujétion de l'argent et contre le déterminisme mécaniste de la technique. Le *Leitmotiv* de tous les programmes est un idéal personnaliste dressé contre le culte de la production, — ce règne des choses — et contre la religion du profit. Ici encore les solutions positives sont divergentes et opposent les jeunes communistes plus ou moins fidèles au mythe marxiste et les nombreux révolutionnaires antimarxistes qui se réclament souvent de Proudhon.

Mais ces définitions seraient très insuffisantes à décrire la fermentation intellectuelle, politique, sociale de la jeunesse française, si l'on ne les complétait par deux remarques capitales. D'abord la reprise aiguë de conscience du sentiment national. Refusant par dégoût, fatigue ou scepticisme les idéologies humanitaires d'hier une grande partie de la jeunesse prétend retrouver dans la communauté nationale un motif d'enthousiasme. C'est dans le cadre de la nation et s'appuyant sur ce patriotisme qu'elle entend créer les nouvelles formes de

vie qu'elle recherche. Phénomène analogue au national-socialisme allemand où deux aspirations distinctes se conjuguent. Naturellement, tout change selon qu'on accorde la primauté à un terme ou à l'autre, même si on les suppose liés : national ou socialisme. C'est ainsi que la ligue des *Croix de Feu*, dont les effectifs grandissent rapidement est surtout préoccupée du premier au lieu que les néo-socialistes insistent sur le deuxième.

En second lieu la revendication des libertés individuelles. Ce n'est pas seulement parce qu'on soupçonne souvent les ligues et partis généralement rapprochés sous l'étiquette « fascisme » d'être des instruments camouflés ou inconscients de la défense capitaliste que l'on engage chez les révolutionnaires de gauche le combat contre ces organisations. C'est aussi par un vieil instinct d'indépendance et même d'individualisme qui refuse ces religions oppressives du groupe.

En résumé, s'il fallait distinguer dans l'ardente confusion de ces volontés révolutionnaires on pourrait, en gros, reconnaître trois grandes fractions, entre lesquelles des alliances locales et momentanées comme des oppositions violentes sont possibles. D'abord les jeunesses nationales, décidées avant tout à mener d'abord contre le parlementarisme démocratique et contre l'oligarchie financière un combat radical où s'élaboreront des formes de vie et de gouvernement d'un âge plus humain ; les jeunesses antifascistes mais aussi anti-marxistes qui reprochent à leurs deux adversaires un matérialisme philosophique et pratique mortel pour la personne humaine (groupe le moins nombreux, peut-être le moins organisé pour une action violente et immédiate, mais sans doute le plus intéressant et le plus conforme à la tradition révolutionnaire française), enfin les jeunesses officiellement communistes dont les buts et les méthodes sont trop connues, trop identiques de par le monde pour qu'il soit nécessaire de les définir. (Notons seulement que le communisme français s'enorgueillit de deux récentes adhésions importantes dans le monde intellectuel : André Gide et le romancier et critique Ramon Fernandez.)

Reste à indiquer la place des raisons ou des convictions religieuses dans ce mouvement. Il faut se souvenir que la France héritière de Voltaire et du laïcisme de la Révolution de 1789 s'est toujours méfiée de l'ingérence de l'Eglise dans le domaine politique et social. Elle est, dans la masse du peuple, anticléricale. Si l'on joint ce trait national au conservatisme, toujours naturel à l'Eglise, d'une part, à la tendance totalitaire du nationalisme et du marxisme d'autre part, on ne sera pas étonné que ces mouvements radicaux n'aient pas leur origine ni leur plus grand écho dans les milieux confessionnels. Il serait néanmoins tout à fait erroné de méconnaître le rôle de personnalités comme André Philip, protestant et socialiste-marxiste, Denis

de Rougemont, protestant et Alexandre Marc, catholique, tous deux de *L'Ordre Nouveau*. Jacques Maritain, inspirateur du manifeste catholique *Pour le bien commun*, ou de groupes comme ceux qui rédigent la revue *Esprit* et qui sont pour la plupart des catholiques convaincus à la recherche de cet ordre chrétien qui rompt avec le désordre établi, et bien d'autres. Il faudrait tout un article pour définir ces positions chrétiennes en face de l'idéologie et des perspectives révolutionnaires (problèmes de la violence, absolu chrétien et relatif humain, pessimisme chrétien et volonté de puissance optimiste, etc.). Relevons seulement à titre d'indication ces lignes extraites d'une lettre écrite à *Esprit* par le président d'une organisation révolutionnaire de droite sur les insuffisances du communisme : « . . . Je sais bien qu'en face d'un temps comme le nôtre, où l'esclavage des esprits est remplacé par leur assassinat organisé (presse, école laïque, cinéma, etc.), je sais bien qu'en face de cette ère capitaliste où la misère envisagée est encore un moyen de gouverner les esprits terrifiés, le communisme peut jouer ses cartes les plus belles. Je sais bien que, selon le mot de Berdiaeff le communisme est le signe de notre devoir, à nous chrétiens, non réalisé. Cependant, je crois justement que la position du catholique est aujourd'hui *plus aisée et plus vraie que jamais* . . . »

« Quelle belle époque que la nôtre ! Voici tout un monde qui halète de la soif de l'héroïsme. Finies les lâchetés de l'individualisme, toutes les idées se valent et à chacun pour soi. Non ! L'homme est fait pour d'autres destins plus grands, plus hauts. La preuve est faite.

« Mais aussi, mais hélas, comment oublier nos faims et nos souffrances — et, dans ce désir même d'héroïsme, notre éternel inapaisement ? Nous sommes faits pour de grands sacrifices — et cependant nous sommes aussi faits pour le bonheur. Ainsi, le communisme, ayant prétendu faire naître une nouvelle nature humaine, est ramené à l'éternelle dualité chrétienne. Il prétend satisfaire l'homme dans l'immédiat, en même temps qu'il le veut élever à l'héroïsme des grands destins. Mais il éclate que l'homme est double, et que satisfait dans sa chair, il souffre d'être limité en esprit ; satisfait en esprit, il sent la chair brûler de concupiscence. Au communisme, il n'y a donc qu'une réponse : et nous seuls, chrétiens, sommes capables de la faire . . . »

In Politics to the Left ; in Religion to the Right

REFLECTIONS ON THE END OF AN ERA. Reinhold Niebuhr. *Charles Scribner's Sons*. New York-London, 1934. \$2.00.

Reinhold Niebuhr owes his great influence over the younger generation of Christians in and outside America to the fact, that (along with a few others) he has the intellectual courage to enter the

largely unexplored and dangerous territory where the great battles of our day are being fought; the "no man's land" between the theological and socio-political trenches. He is, of course, under constant fire from both sides, from those who are safely entrenched in their theological certainties and from those who are no less comfortably installed in their social or political dogmatism. It is, therefore, quite natural that he is rather widely misunderstood. One wonders, however, if the fault is all with his critics. While his books have something of the charm of their adventurous, polemic origin, they are unnecessarily lacking in structure and clarity. Important points are touched on in the most casual way and definitions of the main basic conceptions are lacking. Not all of Niebuhr's readers will reach the supreme heights of misunderstanding arrived at by one of his last critics who has overlooked so thoroughly Niebuhr's unceasing criticisms of the over-simplifications and utopianism in the current orthodoxies of the day, that he accuses him (in *The Christian Century*) of "the romanticism of simplicity and impatience". But the fact remains that because of his epigrammatic style (his book would gain immensely if it were printed in some such form as the *Pensées* of Pascal!) and because of the lack of architecture in the argument, the total impression reminds one too much of fireworks. Niebuhr would render a great service to the cause dear to his heart if some day he would write a book in which brilliant analysis and polemics would not obscure the statement of his own positive convictions. We know perhaps too much already about the paradoxes of our present era and about the inadequacies of all old solutions, but we know precious little about those things which Niebuhr touches as it were between the lines, namely the materials for the elaboration of a theology (not for the social gospel) but for Christian social and political action.

It is true that Niebuhr goes farther in the constructive direction in his last book than in any of his previous books. His advice that we should move to the left in politics and toward the right in religion is by itself helpful and necessary in a time when Christians are still largely engaged in futile discussions between an orthodoxy which sanctifies the *status quo* and a modernism which takes the salt out of the Christian message. The chapters on "The Political Realism of Orthodoxy" and on "The Assurance of Grace" contain insights which, if universally grasped by the Churches, would give us a completely new starting-point for the discussion with the real forces of the modern world. But just because these perspectives are so challenging, we would like to have them developed into a positive theology and ethics rather than offered as interesting "asides".

So far Niebuhr remains too much in the phenomenological and descriptive sphere in which "myths", "symbols", "values" and "ideas" play far too large a rôle and in which the affirmation of the realities of faith, simply because they are true, is overshadowed by ideology. We can no more bring back what Niebuhr calls "classical religion" without accepting its fundamental tenet that God is in Christ than we can be socialists without believing that the means of production ought to be socialised. And if we believe these things why should we not say so; not in terms of myth and symbol (which belong still to very un-classical liberalism) but in terms of reality? In the confrontation with the absolutisms of race, nation or class Christianity is doomed unless it speaks not only of the idea of the absolute but on behalf of the absolute one, that is of God.

V. 'T H.

The Pioneer

John R. MOTT, World Citizen. Basil Mathews. S. C. M., London, 12s. 6d.. Harper, New York, \$3.00.

This is neither a biography in the usual sense of the word nor a description of the development of the various Christian international organisations in which Dr. Mott played and still plays a vital part, but rather, as the author says in his prologue, "an attempt to look at the greatest and most splendid of all world tasks through his eyes". Mr. Basil Mathews has written it because of his conviction that the story of Dr. Mott's life is "at once a challenge and a valid guide for the youth of today".

The central message of this book lies in the vivid presentation of Dr. Mott's *Weltanschauung* as gained through his unusual experiences with men of all trades in all continents and of the fulfilment of a vocation received from God to testify to the redemptive power of Jesus Christ. From the first call which he received as a student, to lead a local student Y.M.C.A., up to the planning and achievements of large international Christian conferences in various continents, the personality of Dr. Mott is shown as endowed with unusual gifts of statesmanship and organisational ability, but above all with an insight into the spiritual and moral needs of individuals and a vision of new relationships between men and men, nations and nations, rooted in his deepest conviction of God's relationship to the human personality and to every realm of human and social life.

The story of the early years of Dr. Mott's life which explain the characteristics of his later achievements will be of special interest to

those who have had the privilege to come to know him more intimately and to serve with him in the World's Student Christian Federation, the Young Men's Christian Association or in the missionary enterprise. The remainder of the book describes vividly and with well-chosen illustrations and quotations his evangelistic missions to students all over the world, his services in war time and as artisan of peace, his share in the new bringing about of cooperation between missionary societies of all denominations. The chapters on "A Master of Assemblies", "Recruiting and Training of Leaders", "The Release and Use of Money", describe the importance given by Dr. Mott to what many would regard as details of no importance in relation to the achievement of the great objective which he pursues. No detail is unworthy of his attention but neither is any goal too big or impossible if it is to the glory of God.

The pre-history and the founding of the W.S.C.F. have a generous but natural place in this book. The Student Christian Movements are mentioned in practically every chapter and with good reason since they played a large part in Dr. Mott's heart and achievements. But those who would look in these pages for a history of the W.S.C.F. will not find it. It still requires to be written — and it should be prepared while most of those who brought it into existence some 40 years ago can still be consulted. The book provides valuable material for this future history. There is no doubt that *John R. Mott, World Citizen* with its underlying philosophy, the faith and religious dynamic which it reveals, "the fascinating technique by which the vision is followed to achievement" will find a warm response amongst those all over the world who belong to the generations influenced by Dr. Mott's Christian ministry especially in Anglo-Saxon countries and in large areas where American education and missionary work and methods have moulded the thought of the present leaders of the Church and of Christian work. If it had been written 20 years ago, students would have responded to it as they did to the call of "the evangelisation of the world in this generation". The present-day university and college students, while very different in outlook and pressed with problems of unemployment, of acute nationalism and of theological questioning, not to be found in this book, should read it not so much as a historical document but as a lasting testimony to the life of a man entirely dedicated to God, through whom God has revealed His eternal Fatherhood and a brotherhood of men transcending race, nationality and the fragility of human philosophical systems.

H. L. H.

Notes on Contributors and Articles

PAUL B. ANDERSON is Secretary of the American Y.M.C.A., working with the Russian Student Christian Movement outside Russia. He is the leader of the Russian Y.M.C.A. Press and editor of *Life in Soviet Russia*.

EDWIN BARKER is the Industrial Secretary of the Student Christian Movement of Great Britain and Ireland and of the Auxiliary Movement and Secretary of the Section on Christianity and Marxism of the Federation's Commission on Christian Faith and Life.

G. FEDOTOFF is Professor at the Orthodox Theological Institute at Paris and editor of a Russian magazine which propagates a renewal of society on Christian foundations.

JOHN B. GROSER is Vicar of Christ Church in the East End of London and is one of the rare Christian ministers who have gained the confidence of social radicals and communists. He was a speaker at last year's Summer Conference of the Federation.

FRANCIS HENSON is the Chairman of the Council of Christian Associations in the U.S.A. He wants it to be understood that he has written his article as an individual representing one group, not the whole of the American Student Christian Movements. He is a member of the section on Christianity and Marxism of the Federation's Commission on Christian Faith and Life.

J. KARUS is a friend of *The Student World*, who writes with special knowledge of the German revolution and whose objectivity of judgment we can guarantee.

JACQUES MARITAIN is a Professor of the "Institut Catholique" at Paris, a widely known champion of Neo-Thomism and author of *Trois Réformateurs*, *Primaauté du Spirituel* and many other books. The "Thoughts" published in this number are chosen by Abbé Charles Journet, editor of *Nova et Vetera* from Professor Maritain's last book *Du régime temporel et de la liberté*.

DENIS DE ROUGEMONT is a Swiss living in France, author of *Le Paysan du Danube* and contributor to many French periodicals, particularly to *L'Ordre Nouveau* and *Hic et Nunc*. He announces three books of literary and political essays for the coming winter.

ALBERTO SIBILLE is the General Secretary of the Y.M.C.A. in Rome. He is in close touch with Italian student life.

The *Book Reviews* are by H. L. Henriod, former Secretary of the W.S.C.F., now General Secretary of the World Alliance for International Friendship through the Churches and of the Universal Council on Life and Work; Pierre Maury, Secretary of the W.S.C.F., and the editor.

The next number of *The Student World* will deal with the subject "Christianity and other Faiths".

The World's Student Christian Federation

What it is - What it does

How Students can participate

(3rd revised edition, 1934)

A 24 page pamphlet on the work and plans of the World Movement of Christian Students.

The most comprehensive short statement of its kind available.

Price per copy : Swiss frs. 0.40 ; 6d. ; \$0.15

50 copies or more : Swiss frs. 0.30 ; 4½d. ; \$0.12

100 copies or more : Swiss frs. 0.25 ; 4d. ; \$0.10

Order from 13 Rue Calvin, Geneva, Switzerland